BETWEEN ROME AND BYZANTIUM

The Golden Age of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania's Political Culture

Second Half of the Fifteenth Century to First Half of the Seventeenth Century

Jūratė Kiaupienė

BETWEEN ROME AND BYZANTIUM

The Golden Age of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania's Political Culture

Lithuanian Studies without Borders

Series Editor
DARIUS STALIŪNAS (Lithuanian Institute of History)

Editorial Board
ZENONAS NORKUS (Vilnius University)
SHAUL STAMPFER (Hebrew University)
GIEDRIUS SUBAČIUS (University of Illinois at Chicago)

BETWEEN ROME AND BYZANTIUM

The Golden Age of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania's Political Culture

Second Half of the Fifteenth Century to First Half of the Seventeenth Century

Jūratė Kiaupienė
Translated by **Jayde Will**

Boston
2019

Table of Contents

Preface

The idea of writing a book that would tell the story of the creation of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania's political culture and its manifestations between the second half of the fifteenth century and the first half of the seventeenth century had a long incubation period. The restoration of an independent Lithuanian state and the study of its history as a discipline in 1990 found political culture as a new and poorly cultivated field of research. The impetus to begin researching the political culture of Lithuania specifically arose from the fact that, after a gap many decades long, the opportunity appeared in Lithuania to become acquainted with research theories and methodology on the issue as well as research on the political culture of other European countries in direct ways and not through rumor or snippets of information. The international context of historiography showed that the time had come to integrate the history of, and research on, the Grand Duchy of Lithuania into the field of European-scale comparative studies. The republication of older sources and the appearance of works of historians who specialized in ancient Lithuanian literature and culture whetted the desire to take on this task. Everyday political life in the restored Lithuanian state and its society strengthened the belief that there was a purpose in going deeper into the political culture of the ancient Grand Duchy of Lithuania and asking whether links could be found between the political culture of today's Lithuania and the political values created and fostered by the society of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania.

The search for conceptual solutions to many issues began in 2013 and lasted several years. Much time for discussion and contemplation was needed to fulfill the wish to formulate a different, more contemporary interpretation based on research as opposed to the kind of interpretation that was entrenched in historiography. International history conferences became a forum where many of the new views toward the Grand Duchy of Lithuania's political nation and culture, expressed in this book, were born and tested in constant flows of ideas as well as regular discussion. What sticks in my mind are the first reactions of fellow historians from Poland and their surprise upon hearing a

different way of speaking about the union between the Kingdom of Poland and the Grand Duchy of Lithuania and the political values of the Lithuanian boyars. After all, historians made it clear long ago that the Grand Duchy of Lithuania's political culture had matured in the womb of the Kingdom of Poland's political culture and adopted the Polish nobility's values and attitudes toward the union of these countries. It is also agreed among historians that the independent-minded position of the magnates, led by the Radziwiłł[1] family, which defended the making of special efforts to distinguish the Grand Duchy of Lithuania as a state when the 1569 Union of Lublin was executed, was determined by their personal ambitions and interests—which the average boyar in the country did not support.

The dialogue that was needed on these points took much effort to launch and proceeded slowly. However, it did begin. Today it is easy to laugh when I remember the spirited debates that took place in Warsaw, Lublin, Kraków, Poznań, Vilnius, and elsewhere. Often the conversations that followed a presentation lasted long into the evening. Also, friendships and working relationships were developed with many of the participants. Today I wish to extend a heartfelt thank you to all of my fellow historians in different countries who have been researching the Grand Duchy of Lithuania. You did much to make this book possible.

I also wish to thank my colleagues and coworkers at the Lithuanian Institute of History for your constant financial and moral support. My colleagues at the Department of the History of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania often became the first readers and reviewers of my texts; they were also willing advisors who, on several occasions, showed me important sources for my research.

Yet another group of people aided me in my efforts: my colleagues, doctoral students, and students at the Department of History at Vytautas Magnus University in Kaunas, where I taught an MA-level history course on Lithuania's political culture for many years. In my seminars, we examined sources, explained their importance, debated, looked for traces of the Grand Duchy's political culture in the political life of society in our modern Republic of Lithuania, and discussed what tied us to the society and culture of the past. It was a lively forum of contact with a new generation of future historians and, for me, a wonderful opportunity to see whether intergenerational dialogue among historians was possible. I give them all a heartfelt thank-you.

---

1 Radziwiłł is the Polish form of this family name. The Latin form is Radivilli, and the Lithuanian—Radvilos.

I cannot list all the names of those who supported and advised me and those who challenged my work with their doubts and criticism. Believe me, I am extremely grateful to all of you for making my work that much better.

The year 2015 marks the quincentennial of the birth of Duke Mikołaj Radziwiłł the Black, one of the most prominent politicians in fostering defending the state of Lithuania in the sixteenth–century. I dedicate this book to the memory of this eminent representative of the political nation of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania. Allow me to quote several lines from the heroic epic "Radviliada," written 423 years ago by the old bard of Lithuanian magnates, the poet Jan Radwan, in which he requests help from goddesses:

> CALLIOPE, atque ERATO veſtras advertite mētes,
> Et date quàm virtus ingentem ad ſydera vexit
> Ductorem Litauûm, dum pace, & Marte ſecundo
> Siſtit rem patriam, qualiſue effuſa per Vlæ
> Tempeſtas ierit campos, per Evanſcia rura.
> Illius immenſis ut laus attonſa Livonum
> Conſiliis, veluti Scythiamque repreſserit héros,
> O memorate DEÆ: tum vos date candida cives
> Omina, nā tibi ſurgit opus LITVANIA PRÆSTANS.

Jonas Radvanas, "Radviliada" (Vilnius: Bibliotheca Baltica, 1997), 6.

This book is a translation of my monograph *Between Rome and Byzantium: The Golden Age of the Grand Duchy of Lithuanian's Political Culture (Second Half of the Fifteenth Century to First Half of the Seventeenth Century)*, originally written in Lithuanian in 2015, without any additional material.

Vilnius, 2018

Introduction

At the turn of the early modern period, new rules began to form in Europe concerning the co-existence of states and societies, political behaviors and communication, and the foundations of a new political system. Contemporary historiography describes this time of great change by invoking the concept of the "long sixteenth century." This period, from the middle of the fifteenth century to the beginning of the Thirty Years' War in 1618—or even up to 1650—is understood as one of transition from the Middle Ages to the early modern period. The "long sixteenth century" concept gives us an opportunity to see the entire spectrum of events during this time in a way that deftly interweaves signs of the end of the Middle Ages and the birth of the early modern period without contrasting these two epochs. This particular periodization allows us to create a somewhat different picture of European history at the time under discussion than is traditionally depicted. In this tableau, the difference between Western Europe, the instigator of innovation, and the laggard regions that merely adopt and repeat innovation is not accentuated. What is emphasized is that the proto-modernist processes had common roots, from which Early Modern Europe grew.[1] In a Europe that is understood in this way, one may also examine the boyar nation of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania—hereinafter, the GDL—illuminate its participation in sociopolitical and sociocultural processes of the epoch, discuss the formation of its political culture, and investigate a broader spectrum of the change that took place within these processes in a European context.

The aim of the study that follows is to show evidence and substantiate the premise that the sociopolitical and sociocultural society of the GDL created

---

1 See *Lietuvos istorija*, vol. 4, ed. J. Kiaupienė and R. Petrauskas: *Nauji horizontai: dinastija, visuomenė, valstybė. Lietuvos Didžioji Kunigaikštystė 1529–1529 m.* (Vilnius: Baltos lankos, 2009), 12–18; *Lietuvos istorija*, vol. 5, ed. J. Kiaupienė and I. Lukšaitė: *Veržli Naujųjų laikų pradžia. Lietuvos Didžioji Kunigaikštystė 1529–1588 metais* (Vilnius: Baltos lankos, 2013), 23–25.

and fostered its own unique political culture from the second half of the fifteenth century to the first half of the seventeenth century—a political culture that I describe as a European phenomenon. This study examines the political views and attitudes of the fully fledged Lithuanian boyar class that preceded the period under discussion, the values created and disseminated within the state and beyond its borders in various ways that depicted the state, its rule, representation, law, and other links within the sociopolitical system, and the results of the real-life implementation of these values. I look for and develop theoretical and source-based arguments that show that the GDL's political culture played the role of a sociopolitical and sociocultural connector and mediator between the geopolitical and geocultural regions of the Roman West and the Byzantine East, and that it formed an ethnically diverse, multilingual, multi-confessional, and multicultural state that became an integral part of the West's political system in the early modern period. This is a geopolitical area where the national identities of different ethnoses formed alongside one another and where a pluralistic sociopolitical community formed a unique form of state identity. I will highlight the long-term effect of this political culture on the formation of the geopolitical and geocultural political mentality of all of Central Eastern Europe. Contemporary historians believe that the GDL's former eastern border area (made up of the Duchy's eastern territories), which seceded from the lands of Muscovy, is today the dividing line between Eastern Europe and Central Eastern Europe. It is also thought that the political mentality of the Lithuanians, Belarusians, and Ukrainians who inhabited the lands of the GDL is different even today as a result.

For this research, I invoke two concepts that researchers of sociopolitical and sociocultural processes coined in order to mark and describe these processes: political culture and political nation.

The expression *political culture* was developed by the sociologists Gabriel Almond and Sidney Verba on the basis of their research on the political attitudes of the inhabitants of five countries (the United States, the United Kingdom, Germany, Italy, and Mexico) in the second half of the twentieth century.[2] It first came into use in sociology and political science in debates over Almond's and Verba's conclusions; later it was adopted and began to be used in research by historians as well. How it is interpreted in contemporary historiography varies,

---

2 G. A. Almond and S. Verba, *The Civic Culture. Political Attitudes and Democracy in Five Nations* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1963).

different methods of research concerning political culture having taken shape. There is a debate over the propriety of searching for methods and forms of the manifestation of political culture in research of historical periods—antiquity, the Middle Ages, the early modern period—or of societies in those eras, or whether political culture is simply a phenomenon of modern times. I will not reenact these theoretical discussions. Instead, I will relate to Stephen Chiloton's discussion of the various ways the term *political culture* is understood, the possibilities of its usage, and its importance for understanding political processes.[3] I also refer to the work of a group of scientists led by Barbara Stollberg-Rilinger, which examined the concept of *political culture* and looked for new theoretical approaches from the perspective of research on cultural history.[4] These and other theoretical and methodological discussions have expanded the initial meaning of political culture and opened the door to possibilities of not only using it in research on contemporary political processes but also of adapting it to various historical periods. A historian who deals with the medieval and early modern eras, however, understands that the concept cannot be invoked without exceptions. Sociologists can carry out a survey among living members of a society and perform empirical research. A historian who examines the political culture of past times cannot do the same; he or she has to work with information encoded in sundry written sources or artifacts that yield various levels of informativeness. A historian must decode this source material and convey the information hidden in it in a scientific language that the modern reader can understand. This is why not only facts, but also the historian's interpretation, are important in this kind of research.

In modern scientific language, the concept of political culture is not understood in the same way by all researchers. Debates take place as to where politics ends and political culture begins and how political culture is tied to political thought. Also debated is whether the concept covers only the realm of the spiritual life of society and the individual, or whether political culture can

---

3 *Grounding Political Development* (2nd [www] edition), http://www.d.umn.edu/~schilton/ Articles/GPD6. html. 2014.11.19; Ronald P. Formisano, "The Concept of Political Culture," *Journal of Interdisciplinary History*, 31, no. 3: (Winter 2001): 393–426; Paul Lichterman and Daniel Cefaï, "The Idea of Political Culture," in *The Oxford Handbook of Contextual Political Analysis*, ed. Robert E. Goodin and Charles Tilly (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006), 392–414.

4 See *Was heißt Kulturgeschichte des Politischen?*, ed. Barbara Stollberg-Rilinger (Berlin: Duncker & Humblot, 2005). Accessed November 19, 2014, http://www.d.umn.edu/~schilton/Articles/GPD6.html.

also be understood as a collection of symbolic actions, with the help of which individuals and groups in society form and implement their goals. Another aspect to consider is whether this concept may be adapted for use in examining the structure and order of the state, its organizational principles, its institutions and their work, and relations between rulers and ruled. Historians may make a significant contribution to the broadening of these theoretical discussions by creating, through their research, a necessary foundation for theoretical insight as well as interpretation, that is, sources. The more such sources appear that researchers can use, the more diverse they will be and the clearer the concept of political culture will become. New opportunities will arise for understanding the mechanisms behind the spreading of political culture in society and ascertaining how political culture is created, identifying the link between political culture and the value systems of classes, groups, and individuals in society, and understanding the formation of political behavior, historical self-understanding, self-awareness, and identity. All of these things will help us to understand what the methods and forms of expressing political culture were. The way a concept is understood is most often determined by the aims of the particular research being done.

In recent years, the concept of political culture has also been increasingly used in the Lithuanian scientific language and public sphere. The theoretical aspects of this issue, however, have not yet been fully discussed. This also goes for the state of research concerning the political culture of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania. In this book, political culture is understood in its broad sense, as the full array of theoretical premises that were formed, and practical actions taken, by the country's sociopolitical and sociocultural society in the early modern period.

The concept of the *political nation,* like that of the political culture, has no roots in history and is a construct of modern political philosophy. Historians question the validity of this concept and its use in research on the sociopolitical and sociocultural history of the medieval and early modern periods. Some accept the concept and use it; others reject it as an unfounded modernization of historical events. These two poles can also be seen in contemporary Lithuanian historiography. The views of Alvydas Nikžentaitis and Ingė Lukšaitė stand out in this context due to their emphasis on using the term in their work. Both historians tie the issue of the political nation/community to the problem of national identity, but arrive at different conclusions. Nikžentaitis uses the concept to show that the latest research on political nations considers the political nation an ethno-political structure that encompasses politically active representatives

of the magnate class, who were characterized by a clearly expressed national self-awareness. He highlights the fact that the most recent literature on the subject emphasizes, in particular, the importance of national self-awareness. Namely, the existence or absence of such awareness is considered the most important criterion of a political nation in the medieval or early modern period.[5] Lukšaitė, discussing the accuracy of the concept of the political nation and the practicality of its use, emphasizes that though this term has spread in works that investigate GDL history, there are other views about its suitability in both of its components. In lieu of "political nation" (*politinė tauta* in Lithuanian), she proposes the term "state nation" (*valstybinė tauta* in Lithuanian) as developed by Anna Kłoskowska, a Polish researcher of sociological theories and concepts relating to the development of society. If so, the term would denote two things: political and state consolidation, and ethnic (national) processes. To skirt the ambiguity of the concept in Lithuanian, it would be worth forgoing the term *tauta* (nation) when one wishes to describe a community that has jelled to create a state in cases where its ethnic consolidation is not being examined. This would lessen the confusion that stalks these concepts. Lukšaitė suggests that we call a community that is created or that unites by belonging to a state a *political community* or a *state community*, because political communities and national traits are not one and the same.[6]

In each case, historians determine the primary concepts that they place in their theoretical toolkits on the basis of their research priorities and strategies. The terms *political nation* and *political culture* are chosen by those who favor a strategy of constructivism—who in talking about the past strive to not repeat the language of their sources and instead to create their own conceptual scientific language that is understandable to the modern reader.[7] Having chosen the theoretical concept of constructivism as our preference, I invoke concepts in this study that currently are widely accepted and most often used by historians.

5 Alvydas Nikžentaitis, "Lietuvos Didžiosios Kunigaikštystės politinės tautos specifika ir santykis su modernia tauta," in *Praeities pėdsakais. Skiriama Profesoriaus daktaro Zigmanto Kiaupos 65-mečiui*, ed. Edmundas Rimša, Egidijus Aleksandravičius, and Artūras Dubonis (Vilnius: LII leidykla, 2007), 135–154.

6 Ingė Lukšaitė, "Liublino unija ir identitetų kaitos Lietuvos Didžiojoje Kunigaikštystėje XVI a. antroje pusėje" / "Unia lubelska a zmiany tożsamości w Wielkim Księstwie Litewskim w drugiej połowie XVI wieku," in *Liublino unija: idėja ir jos tęstinumas / Unia lubelska: idea i jej kontynuacja*, ed. Liudas Glemža and Ramunė Šmigelskytė-Stukienė (Vilnius: Nacionalinis muziejus Lietuvos Didžiosios Kunigaikštystės valdovų rūmai, 2011), 224–225; 243.

7 See Zenonas Norkus, "Maxo Weberio feodalizmo samprata ir Lietuvos istorija," *Lietuvos istorijos studijos* 1 (1997): 44–45.

Were I to create new terms in this case, I would only introduce additional confusion. Furthermore, it would be unhelpful in clarifying the concepts and allowing for the discovery of a language acceptable to everyone.

For the topic of this study, I choose the term *political nation* to describe the full-fledged multi-ethnic, multilingual, multi-confessional, and multi-cultural boyar community that developed in the GDL, which sat at the geopolitical and geocultural crossroads between Western (Roman) civilization and Eastern (Byzantine) civilization. This term best captures the nature of the sociopolitical and sociocultural demos that was brought together by the ancient Lithuanian state and its policies, which created and fostered a unique political culture at the beginning of the early modern period. Sources bear witness to the fact that during the time under discussion, this community would affirm its belonging to the state with the words "We, Lithuania," and "We, the nation of Lithuania."[8] When modified by the adjective *political*, the word *nation* takes on a meaning that is broader than the modern understanding of the nation. In the context of Lithuanian historiographical research, I discuss the concept of the political nation more comprehensively in the chapter titled "A Sociopolitical and Sociocultural Portrait of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania."

The metaphor *golden age* in the title of this book was chosen to emphasize that the period at issue—from the second half of the fifteenth century to the first half of the seventeenth—was an uninterrupted term in which the political nation of the GDL developed, creating and fostering a unique culture of state rule and the defense and representation of itself. It was a time when the political nation first adopted the political values created by the medieval Lithuanian ducal monarchy and then breathed into them a spirit formed by the Renaissance and Early Baroque cultures. In the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, these values underwent modifications that were determined largely by a new epoch and that became intellectual wealth in the hands of the heirs of the history of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania, the modern nations of Central Eastern Europe. They used this intellectual wealth in creating their nation states, the manifestation of which can be seen in the mentality of the modern nations in that region. By acquainting ourselves with political culture, we may see the mental ties that link contemporary societies with the world of values fostered in the past.

---

8 See Jūratė Kiaupienė, *"Mes, Lietuva." Lietuvos Didžiosios Kunigaikštystės bajorija XVI a. (viešasis ir privatus gyvenimas)* (Vilnius: Kronta, 2003).

This study covers the period from the second half of the fifteenth century to the first half of the seventeenth century. The date chosen for the beginning of this era was the election of the youngest son of the Polish King and Lithuanian Grand Duke Jogaila, Casimir, as the Grand Duke of Lithuania in 1440. The choice of Casimir was coordinated neither with King Władysław III of Poland, Casimir's older brother, nor with the magnates of the Kingdom of Poland. It reflected the political will of Lithuania's political elite, which represented the still-forming political nation. The election of Casimir as Grand Duke violated the 1413 Union of Horodło[9] and bore witness to the process of consolidation that was occurring among Lithuania's magnates and the new relationship that was being created with Casimir and the magnates of the Kingdom of Poland, with whom they were bound together by the tethers of a dynastic union.[10] A new trait that united this embryonic political community was the understanding that the Grand Duchy of Lithuania was the state not only of the Grand Duke but also of themselves, meaning, it was their political homeland. According to Stephen C. Rowell, the concept of this state as the homeland of this political nation is key to understanding the pluralistic Grand Duchy of Lithuania as well as Lithuanian-Polish relations in the mid-fifteenth century.[11]

Perhaps the most important event in the creation of the Lithuanian political nation and the political and social life of the state was the privilege of May 2, 1447, issued by Lithuanian Grand Duke Casimir in response to the concrete political situation in which the ruler of the country resided elsewhere. With Casimir taking the Polish throne, the privilege emphasized his relationship with the sovereign political nation of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania as the heir to the Lithuanian state and to the Gediminids' dynastic rights. Casimir

---

9   On October 2, 1413, King Jogaila of Poland and Grand Duke Vytautas of Lithuania held a summit in Horodło with representatives of the magnates and boyars from both states. The documents adopted at the summit are examined in *1413 m. Horodlės aktai (dokumentai ir tyrinėjimai) / Akty Horodelskie z 1413 roku (dokumenty i studia)*, ed. Jūratė Kiaupienė, Lidia Korczak, Piotr Rabiej, Edmundas Rimša, Jan Wroniszewski (Vilnius: Lietuvos istorijos instituto leidykla, 2013).

10 For a prosoprographic portrait of the magnates at the time under discussion, see Rimvydas Petrauskas, *Lietuvos diduomenė XIV a. pabaigoje—XV a. Sudėtis—struktūra—valdžia* (Vilnius: Aidai, 2003), 188–208.

11 Stephen C. Rowell, "Casimir Jagiellończyk and the Polish Gamble, 1445–7," *Lithuanian Historical Studies* 4 (1999): "In the 1440s the Lithuanian nobility was only just beginning to consolidate its nascent opinion that the Grand Duchy was its political patrimony too. It is in patrimony, not patriotism that key to understanding the mid-fifteenth-century pluralistic Grand Duchy and Lithuano-Polish relations, especially the coronation election of 1445–47 lies" (39).

promised in this document that he would give estates, castles, and secular and ecclesiastical positions only to local nobility and not decide upon issues of the Grand Duchy of Lithuanian without the consent of the land's magnates. Thus the principle of *ius indigenatus,* which had become entrenched in many European countries at the time—reserving offices and positions for the nobility of the country—was extended to the Lithuanian case. Boyars wishing to improve their knightly skills were allowed to leave the country, unhindered, to all foreign lands except those that were enemies. This opened up cultural and political contacts with Renaissance Europe.

The 1447 privilege, couched in legal jargon, recorded the foundations of the independence of the GDL boyar class and launched a new period for the still-formative political nation to participate in ruling the state. The privilege was not the act of a medieval ruler who applied it in reflection of his good will and grace as before, but a formalized agreement with his subjects that created social ties based on the concepts of *laws* and *obligations.* The character and spirit of the 1447 act is proof of the changes that were going on in the GDL's early period of modernization.

Alexander, succeeding Casimir as Grand Duke of Lithuania in 1492, issued a privilege of his own the same year. The document did more than reconfirm all the obligations of earlier rulers to the Lithuanian state and its political community; it included new articles. The most important of them in terms of political culture was the enshrining in law of a political institution that had grown out of the Grand Duke's council—the Council of Lords—and the prerogatives of its work. In the privilege, Alexander promised to refrain from amending resolutions taken by the Grand Duke together with the Council of Lords. From then on, GDL officials had to be appointed and dismissed, as well as foreign policy agreed upon, with the knowledge and consent of the Council of Lords.[12]

A new situation arose at the end of the fifteenth century, the most important trait of which was that the Council of Lords, which was made up of representatives of the political nation—high ecclesiastical and secular officials—received political rights and assumed political obligations in tandem with the ruler as a "collective" monarch or, alternatively, a "corporative" dynasty.[13] In a 1506

---

12   See *Lietuvos istorija*, vol. 4, 315–320.

13   The concept of a "corporative" dynasty, which supplemented the Jagiellonian dynasty in tandem with the formation and strengthening of the political society (the nation), is discussed in Stephen C. Rowell, "Išdavystė ar paprasti nesutarimai? Kazimieras Jogailaitis ir Lietuvos diduomenė 1440–1481 metais," in *Lietuvos valstybė XII-XVIII a.*, ed. Zigmantas Kiaupa, Arturas Mickevičius, and Jolita Sarcevičienė (Vilnius, 1997), 45–74; Stephen C. Rowell,

privilege declared by Sigismund the Old and a 1529 privilege proclaimed by Sigismund Augustus, the rights of the Council were reconfirmed and extended.

This study ends with the beginning of the military and political crisis that struck the Commonwealth of the Two Nations and all of Central Eastern Europe in the middle of the seventeenth century. Although the Grand Duchy of Lithuania as a political and state entity withstood these upheavals, its society emerged from the crisis having experienced massive demographic, material, and spiritual losses. The Union of Kėdainiai—the agreement executed between the GDL and the Kingdom of Sweden on October 20, 1655 in Kėdainiai—is chosen as the symbolic event that marks the end of this stage of the country's political culture. With this act, the GDL's 1569 union with the Kingdom of Poland was terminated and the Duchy seceded from the Commonwealth of the Two Nations. The Union was signed by more than 1,100 representatives of the GDL's political nation, who, in their own name and that of their successors, renounced their loyalty to King John (II) Casimir Vasa of Poland, abolished all rights of the Lithuanian state, and declared Swedish King Charles X Gustav[14] the Grand Duke of Lithuania. This, the Lithuanian historian Gintautas

---

"Bears and Traitors, or Political Tensions in the Grand Duchy, ca. 1440–1481," *Lithuanian Historical Studies* 2 (1997): 28–55: "The importance of family tradition in the consolodation of the political nation, of inherited interest, of a corporative 'alternative' to the royal line" (44).

14   There are numerous and often opposing views of the 1655 Treaty of Kėdainiai in historiography. A classic work of Lithuanian historiography is Adolfas Šapoka's study *1655 metų Kėdainių sutartis, arba* švedai *Lietuvoje 1655–1656 metais* (Vilnius: Mokslas 1990), written on the eve of World War II and published by Antanas Tyla in 1990. A new view of the subject in Lithuanian historiography is laid out in *Lietuvos istorija*, vol. 6, ed. Gintautas Sliesoriūnas: *Lietuvos Didžioji Kunigaikštystė XVI a. pabaigoje—XVIII a. pradžioje (1588–1733)* (Vilnius: Lietuvos istorijos instituto leidykla, 2015). An interpretation by contemporary Polish historiography is laid out in *Wielka Historia Polski*, vol. 3, part 1, ed. Józef Andrzej Gierowski: *Rzeczpospolita w dobie złotej wolności (1648–1763)* (Kraków: Fogra Oficyna Wydawnicza 2003). Another stance in contemporary historiography is discussed in a dissertation prepared and published in Sweden: Andrej Kotljarchuk, *In the Shadows of Poland and Russia. The Grand Duchy of Lithuania and Sweden in the European Crisis of the Mid-Seventeenth Century* (Huddinge: Södertörns högskola, 2006). A short overview of evaluations of discussions on the Treaty of Kėdainiai is provided in Jūratė Kiaupienė and Andrzej Zakrzewski, "Unie polsko-litewskie—próba nowego spojrzenia," in *Lex est Rex in Polonia et in Lithuania ... Tradycje prawno-ustrojowe Rzeczypospolitej—doświadczenie i dziedzictwo*, ed. Adam Jankiewicz (Warsaw: Wydawnictwo Trybunału Konstytucyjnego, 2008), 65–82; second supplemented edition: Jūratė Kiaupienė and Andrzej Zakrzewski, "Unie polsko-litewskie—spojrzenie z dwóch stron," in *Lex est Rex in Polonia et in Lithuania ... Tradycje prawno-ustrojowe Rzeczypospolitej—doświadczenie i dziedzictwo*, ed. Adam Jankiewicz (Warsaw: Wydawnictwo Trybunału Konstytucyjnego, 2011), 61–84.

Sliesoriūnas states with emphasis, was the only true attempt to break the ties between Lithuania and Poland ever since 1569 Union of Lublin brought the Commonwealth into being.

The 1655 Union of Kėdainiai did not create a political entity. The Grand Duchy of Lithuania renewed state ties with the Kingdom of Poland and the Commonwealth of the Two Nations remained on Europe's geopolitical map. It did, however, change. The preconditions for change in its political culture emerged during the years of war and occupation in the mid-seventeenth century. What we see in this political culture are traits of a different nature, marked by crisis at the geopolitical and statehood levels. The attitudes and behavior of the Commonwealth's political communities also changed—a topic that can be viewed more deeply only through separate research.

The political culture of the GDL from the second half of the fifteenth century to the first half of the seventeenth century has not been fully examined in Lithuanian historiography as a separate subject of research. The first observations on the unique traits of this culture in the sixteenth century, which taken and introduced to an international audience more than a decade ago, did not provoke discussion.[15] More recently in his first volume[16] of a three-part series, the Lithuanian historian Darius Kuolys focuses most of his attention on certain forms of expression of political culture in the Grand Duchy of Lithuania from the fifteenth century to the seventeenth century. Kuolys emphasizes that the still-extant division between ancient Lithuania and modern Lithuania and the GDL's fragmented narrative were among the most important aspects that spurred him to do more in-depth research on this story and try to shed more light on the core ideas, symbolic meanings, images, and commonalities of this narrative. The cultural issues that he examines, as well as his sources, often intersect with those of our study. I will be taking a look at Kuolys's ideas and observations frequently and either use them as a predicate for my own observations or discuss them in greater detail.

---

15 Jūratė Kiaupienė, "Litewskie cechy kultury politycznej szlachty Wielkiego Księstwa Litewskiego w XVI wieku," in *Kultura Litwy i Polski w dziejach. Tożsamość i współistnienie*, ed. Jerzy Wyrozumski (Kraków: Międzynarodowe Centrum Kultury w Krakowie 2000), 67–78; Iurate Kiaupene, "Osobennosti politicheskoĭ kul'tury Velikogo Kniazhestva Litovskogo v XVI v.," in *Balty i Velikoe kniazhestvo Litovskoe. Istoriko-lingvisticheskiĭ vzgliad* (Moscow: Novoe izdatel´stvo, 2007), 54–66. See also *XVI amžiaus Lietuvos ir Lenkijos politinės kultūros šaltiniai (1562 metų tekstai)*, compiled by Jūratė Kiaupienė (Vilnius: Leidykla Eugrimas 2008).

16 D. Kuolys, *Res Lituana. Kunigaikštystės bendrija*, v. 1: *Respublikos steigimas* (Vilnius: Lietuvių literatūros ir tautosakos institutas, 2009).

Polish historiography understands and treats the GDL's political culture differently. Its long-standing view is dominated by the belief that the Polish-Lithuanian union created in 1386 gave rise to the beginning of the integration of the Lithuanian state and Lithuanian boyar class into their Polish equivalents, culminating in the sixteenth century with the total integration of the two political bodies and the creation of an undivided Poland. This tradition of incorporation does not recognize the independent sociopolitical and sociocultural role of the GDL's political community.

It is in this spirit of Polish historiography that the Polish historian Edward Opaliński produced his study on political culture, which translates into English as "The political culture of the Polish Szlachta 1587–1652: Parliamentary system and civic culture."[17] If we take this title verbatim, we could put the book aside in the belief that it covers only the political culture of Poland. In explaining his aim, however, Opaliński states his intent to reveal as fully as possible the understanding of the meaning of political culture for the Polish, Lithuanian, and Ruthenian *szlachta*[18] at the end of the sixteenth century and first half of the seventeenth. His topics of research are the attitudes of the *szlachta* toward the Republic's political system and its constituent institutions; the *szlachta*'s value system and political identity; its reaction to central government's decisions, and its demands of and aims vis-à-vis the creators of the political system. Finally, as Opaliński writes, the research also covers the ties between political order and political culture. This kind of inquiry, he hopes and states with emphasis, will allow him to determine whether the Polish, Lithuanian, and Ruthenian political culture [sic Opaliński] truly showed traits of civic culture characteristic of societies that have an understanding of political responsibility.[19]

---

17   E. Opaliński, *Kultura polityczna szlachty polskiej w latach 1587–1652. System parlamentarny a społeczeństwo obywatelskie* (Warsaw: Wydawnictwo Sejmowe, 1995). Opaliński also discusses earlier twentieth-century Polish historiographical research on the issue (10–15).

18   In Polish historiography, the word *szlachta* (*šlėkta* in Lithuanian) denotes the middle and petty boyars, as distinct from the *magnatów* (magnates), who comprised the highest boyar class. Lithuanian historians use the term "boyar" to denote all members of the aristocracy. When I do the same, I do not attempt to erase the borders that mark their internal categorization, overlook differences among members of the class, and on this basis determine their economic, social, and political status in society. Concepts such as "dukes," "magnates," and middle, petty, or regular "boyars" are used in this book to distinguish among strata within this class. I use the word *szlachta*, a lexeme of Polish origin that a specific meaning like the Latin *nobilis*, only in quoting sources or other authors' research and in writing about Polish society. See Kiaupienė, *"Mes, Lietuva,"* 50–69.

19   Opaliński, *Kultura polityczna,* 15–16: "Cel, który przed sobą stawiamy, to możliwie całościowe ujęcie kultury politycznej szlachty polskiej, litewskiej i ruskiej u schyłku XVI

If so, the primary subject of Opaliński's research is the civic attitude of the *szlachta* of the Commonwealth of the Two Nations. Opaliński defines the *szlachta* as a demos of boyars united by class that fostered identical political values and agreed on the tools with which to achieve their goals. Opaliński does not consider when and how this integrated political group arose and of what it was composed. He does address himself to the last-mentioned question in his own way, however, by examining the historical identity of the Commonwealth's *szlachta*. He has no doubts that the *szlachta* of Poland, Lithuania, and Rus', the land of the Ruthenians, knew that their forefathers had lived in separate state organisms and that living traditions of their own statehood persisted at the time under discussion. However, the existence of this identity did not hinder the forming of a common *szlachta* tradition. The creation of the Commonwealth's political system and the process of the *szlachta*'s acquisition of political rights, which began in the late fourteenth century and lasted several hundred years, created the conditions for the formation not only of an integrated *szlachta* but also of a common historical identity. In Opaliński's opinion, several factors influenced this process powerfully, foremost the long-term nature of the integration process, the gradual inclusion of Ruthenians and Lithuanians in it, and recognition of the *szlachta*'s languages and religions as equal under the law. It is also important that Poland's *szlachta* gave preference to the traditions of the Jagiellonian dynasty, which were shared by Poles, Lithuanians, and Ruthenians, and not to those of the Piast dynasty.[20] Through this understanding, Opaliński

---

wieku i w pierwszej połowie następnego stulecia. Zgodnie z przyjętą definicją przedmiotem badań są postawy szlachty wobec panującego w Rzeczypospolitej systemu politycznego, w tym poszczególnych instytucji tworzących go, a także szlachecki system wartości i świadomość polityczna, reakcje społeczeństwa szlacheckiego na decyzje władz centralnych oraz postulaty i żądania pod adresem instytucji tworzących system polityczny. Przedmiotem badań stały się wreszcie relacje między ustrojem politycznym a kulturą polityczną. Spodziewamy się, iż takie ujęcie tematu umożliwi udzielenie odpowiedzi na pytanie, czy kultura polityczna szlachty polskiej, litewskiej i ruskiej posiadała istotnie cechy kultury obywatelskiej, charakterystycznej dla społeczeństw świadomych własnej podmiotowości i własnej politycznej odpowiedzialności."

20 Ibid., 52: "Czy historia była czynnikiem integrującym społeczeństwo szlacheckie i czy istniała wspólna tradycja historyczna dla całej szlachty Rzeczypospolitej? Nie ulega wątpliwości, że szlachta polska, litewska i ruska były świadome, że w przeszłości przodkowie ich zamieszkiwali odrębne organizmy państwowe. Tradycja własnych państwowości była w interesującym nas okresie wciąż żywa. Jednakże fakt jej istnienia nie przeszkadzał w wykształceniu się wspólnej dla całej braci herbowej tradycji historycznej. Trwający od schyłku XIV stulecia kilkusetletni proces powstawania systemu politycznego Rzeczypospolitej i związanego z nim uzyskiwania praw politycznych przez szlachtę sprzyjał nie tylko powstaniu zintegrowanego społeczeństwa szlacheckiego, ale także narodzeniu się wspólnej tradycji i wspólnej

sees the GDL's political nation and its culture as integral parts of the political culture of a joint state—the Commonwealth of the Two Nations, which in his study he most often calls Poland.

Another distinguishing trait of Opaliński's concept of political culture is his particular focus on the values of the boyars' civic culture (*społeczeństwo obywatelskie*) and the way those of this class expressed them in the public sphere of the Commonwealth. Civic culture, Opaliński states, fully matured and was adopted by most of Poland's *szlachta* and the Lithuanian and Ruthenian boyars during the second interregnum (1574–1576), which ensued upon the death of Sigismund Augustus, the last ruler of the Jagiellonian dynasty (the first interregnum having occurred in 1572).[21] By the middle of the sixteenth century, Opaliński emphasizes, the boyars already clearly understood that they were living in a "free Commonwealth" (*libera Respublica*), were "free citizens" (*liberi cives*), had the right to freely express their opinions on public matters to officials and the monarch, and considered synonymous the concepts of "free Poles," "free noblemen," and "free citizens."[22]

Andrzej Sulima Kamiński presents his own picture of political culture of the Commonwealth in his study entitled "The History of Many of the Nations of the Republic, 1505–1795. Citizens, their States, Society, Culture." A. S. Kamiński centers not on the state and political history of the Kingdom of Poland and the Grand Duchy but on civic society and the political culture that evolved in these countries between the sixteenth and eighteenth centuries.

świadomości historycznej. Zadecydowało o tym kilka czynników. Pierwszym z nich była długotrwałość procesu integracyjnego, drugim—fakt stopniowego włączania w ten proces Rusinów i Litwinów. Kolejnym czynnikiem było równouprawnienie całej szlachty, bez względu na pochodzenie etniczne, używany język i wyznawaną religię. Niebagatelną rolę odegrał też fakt, że szlachta polska preferowała bardziej tradycję jagiellońską niż piastowską, a więc tę tradycję, która była wspólna Polakom, Litwinom i Rusinom."

21 E. Opaliński, "Civic Culture of the Polish Nobility in the Sixteenth and Early Seventeenth Century," in *Political Culture in Central Europe (10th—20th Century)*, part 1: *Middle Ages and Early Modern Era*, ed. Halina Manikowska and Jaroslav Pánek in cooperation with Martin Holý (Prague: Institute of History, 2005), 233: "Civic culture was already fully developed among most of the Polish, Lithuanian, and Ruthenian nobility during the second interregnum (1574–1576)."

22 Ibid.: "Of what did 'civic culture' consist? Foremost, as early as the middle of the sixteenth century, noblemen realized that they were 'free citizens' (*liberi cives*) in a 'free Commonwealth' (*libera Respublica*), that they had the rights freely to express their opinions on public matters to officials and the monarch, and that they were duty bound to claim their own and other estates' rights and liberties as well as public rights. It is worth stressing that the notions 'free Poles', 'free noblemen' and 'free citizens' were used interchangeably."

In his book,[23] he portrays sixteenth-century Central Eastern Europe as a region of states that fell under the dictates neither of the political or national orders that had developed in Western Europe nor of those in Eastern Europe. Neither Absolutism nor even strong monarchical rule prevailed there. On the contrary, for two hundred years as absolute monarchs ruled much of Europe, parliamentarism and democracy flourished in Central Eastern Europe. The political culture that sprang into being in sixteenth-century Poland created a particular climate for this culture, infused the population with love of freedom, a sense of personal dignity, attachment to self-rule institutions, and pride in its ability to use these institutions to rein in the state's power. Kamiński attempts to reveal systematically how, starting with the Nihil Novi constitution that the Polish Sejm adopted in 1505, igniting the process of creating a new civic state, a period of three hundred years followed that brought with it complex, multi-leveled, and often conflicting state-level and social processes.

One who reads Kamiński's book might suspect, at first glance, that Kamiński is perhaps too much in love with his proverbial child, that is, the Executionist movement of the Polish *szlachta* in the first half of the sixteenth century, attempting to highlight only the positive sides and achievements of what he calls civic society and unduly criticizing the boyars of the GDL, who, in his opinion, never managed to overcome the imbalance of a handful of magnate families at the state level and the sejms. This impression is strengthened by Kamiński's belief that Poland's Executionist movement, which in the sixteenth century demanded the strengthening of union ties with Lithuania, was not a Trojan horse that sought to reduce the Grand Duchy into something akin to a Polish colony. It was simply a vehicle with which they wanted to restructure the Lithuanian state, that is, the formerly strong hereditary monarchy that collaborated with the Grand Duke to wield power in conjunction with a small group of powerful aristocrats. The GDL's governmental and political structure, says Kamiński, was more similar to the structure of Muscovy than to that of Poland after reforms in the middle of the sixteenth century. The Lithuanian Grand Duke, like the ruler of Muscovy, beheaded his highest officials, and ruled, imagining that it was he who created the law. The members of the Grand Duke's council, although directly subordinate to Duke *de jure*, ruled the numerous boyars on whom they were dependent. Until the 1660s, Lithuania was a monarchy, its parliament dependent on the state's ruler and a powerful council. Its political system was closer to that of Henry VIII in England

---

23 A. S. Kamiński, *Historia Rzeczypospolitej Wielu Narodów, 1505–1795. Obywatele, ich państwa, społeczeństwo, kultura* (Lublin: Instytut Europy Środkowo-Wschodniej, 2000).

and Vasily III in Russia than to that of Poland. This is why, as Kamiński writes, it is no surprise that it was feared in Poland that the Jagiellonians, using their powerful ally, the ruler of Lithuania—might imperil Polish freedoms. This, he emphasizes, is why Lithuania's broad boyar masses, which strove for such freedoms, hurried to create a new union with Poland.[24]

The image presented by Polish historians, of an integrated political culture that was broadly determined by ties between the ideology of boyar freedoms and a union, obscures the full spectrum of variety among the boyar societies of the Kingdom of Poland and the Grand Duchy of Lithuania. What is more, the two political nations that merged in the 1569 Union of Lublin, Poland and Lithuania, remained extremely different and had different aims that arose from different understandings of the union itself and of the Commonwealth. While pursuing coexistence, the GDL made perceptible efforts to create a separate political space and their own state institutions within the composite state.[25]

In her article on the political ideology of Lithuania's Evangelical Lutherans during the rule of the Vasas, which falls within the period discussed in this monograph,[26] the Polish historian Urszula Augustyniak discusses aspects particular to the GDL's political culture. Emphasizing the dearth of substantial changes either in Poland or in Lithuania in research of political culture in recent years, she calls for greater clarity as to whether the political culture of seventeenth-century Lithuania preserved the uniquenesses that it had established in the fifteenth century and demonstrates research methods that may be used to address the point. In terms of political culture, Augustyniak's observation deserves serious attention in that one should seek out the special traits of the GDL's political ideology and historical tradition not only by examining the most important theoretical works known in research (including those of Andreas Volanus and Adomas Rasijus) but also by probing what she calls "pragmatic written works" (polemics, panegyrics, and orators' speeches) in search of the Lithuanian contribution to the Commonwealth's political culture. These

---

24 Ibid., 31, 49–50.

25 The Polish historian Henryk Lulewicz discusses the differences that existed during the 1569–1588 period and examines their precipitants and origins. See Henryk Lulewicz, *Gniewów u unię ciąg dalszy. Stosunki Polsko-Litewskie w latach 1569–1588* (Warsaw: Neriton, 2002).

26 Urszula Augustyniak, "Ideologia polityczna ewangelików litewskich w czasach dwu pierwszych Wazów," in *Lietuvos Didžiosios Kunigaikštystės istorijos kraštovaizdis*, ed. Ramunė Šmigelskytė Stukienė (Vilnius: Lietuvos istorijos instituto leidykla, 2012), 345–368.

works affected society's attitudes somewhat more than academic tracts did and had an impact on practical political decisions as well.

In this monograph, I will try to broaden the scope of what we know of the GDL's political culture. My underlying premise is that the 1569 Union of Lublin declared the joining of two states, the Kingdom of Poland and the Grand Duchy of Lithuania, into a composite monarchy but did not create a unified boyar society and culture; instead, it merely created the conditions for such a society and culture to form. I will not apply to society in the GDL the model of Polish society, in which, starting from the first half of the sixteenth century, one can clearly see the active position and the independent political endeavors of the *szlachta*. Were I to do this, I would risk heaping traits and attitudes upon GDL society that are not characteristic of it.

The GDL's political culture took shape and prospered in the geopolitical and geocultural space of Central Eastern Europe. In the past few years, research on the political culture of this region has begun to insert themes pertaining to Lithuania in the discussion. This opens the door to comparision of the culture of Lithuania's political nation with the cultures of other political societies in the region. A recent collection of articles that examine the interaction between political culture and the rise of the state in Europe in 1300–1900 provides a new opportunity to rethink the contribution of the GDL's political culture to the creation of the Lithuanian state.[27] The contributors to that collection, however, did not research the political culture of the GDL from this perspective. Instead, they examined the topic by centering on the special traits of the development of statehood "from below," revealing the contributions of classes, corporations, societies, and citizens. The authors choseas the starting point of the discussion the confederation of Switzerland as a model for the creation of a state. The historiography in this collection follows additional avenues to explain the processes behind the creation of states in Europe. The scope of that book is supplemented by André Holenstein's introduction, which provides a comprehensive bibliography on the role of political culture in the creation of states. This important book, however, while elucidating the nexus of political culture and the state, overlooks the political culture of the Kingdom of Poland, the Grand Duchy of Lithuania, and the Commonwealth of the Two Nations, even though its second part, "Central and Eastern Europe" might lead us to believe otherwise.

---

27 *Empowering Interactions. Political Cultures and the Emergence of the State in Europe 1300–1900,* ed. Wim Bloockmans, André Holenstein, and Jon Mathieu in collaboration with Daniel Schläppi (Farnham: Ashgate, 2009).

New views on the culture of Central Eastern Europe in the Middle Ages are enunciated from various perspectives in a recent collection of scientific essays.[28] This volume, the cooperative product of researchers from different academic cultures, opened up unexpected and innovative avenues for research on culture. Notably, however, these new observations on the region's culture are presented through the traditional paradigm of the three core states—Poland, Hungary, and Bohemia—making the cultural history of medieval Lithuania an integral part of the culture of Poland.

There is also a comparative view of the region's political culture, presented in a similar fashion in a collection of articles that summarize the results of a joint research project carried out by the Institute of History of the Academy of Sciences of the Czech Republic and its counterpart in Poland. This collection bases its contents on the same three core states.[29] In their introductory article, Stanisław Bylina and Jaroslav Pánek do note that two political nations, each fostering a different tradition, were adjoined and began to co-inhabit a Polish-Lithuanian state that was created in 1569.[30] However, Marcel Kosman and Edward Opaliński, who contributed articles on the political culture of the GDL and the Commonwealth of the Two Nations, did not overshoot the boundaries of traditional interpretation in Polish historiography. They focus their attention on the ever-closer ties of the political cultures of societies that were tethered in the union, which brought about integration and the adoption of the thinking and behavior of Poland's boyar class.[31]

In terms of its contribution to historiography, this study presents the GDL's political culture as an independent phenomenon within European culture and shows how it concurrently unified and divided the political societies and political cultures of the two states, the Grand Duchy of Lithuania and the Kingdom of Poland. By uncovering the development of the GDL's political culture and explaining how it matured, it produces a picture that, I hope, will

---

28 *Central and Eastern Europe in the Middle Ages. A Cultural History, Essays in Honour of Paul W. Knoll,* ed. Piotr Górecki and Nancy Van Deusen (New York: Tauris Academic Studies, 2009).

29 *Political Culture in Central Europe (10th–20th Century),* part 1: *Middle Ages and Early Modern Era.*

30 S. Bylina and J. Pánek, "Political Culture in the Middle Ages and the Early Modern Era (until the End of the Eighteenth Century," in *Political Culture in Central Europe (10th–20th Century),* part 1: *Middle Ages and Early Modern Era,* 22.

31 M. Kosman, "Political Culture in Lithuania in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries," in *Political Culture in Central Europe (10th–20th Century),* part 1: *Middle Ages and Early Modern Era,* 249–265; Edward Opaliński, "Civic Culture of the Polish Nobility in the Sixteenth and Early Seventeenth Century," in ibid., 233–248.

give historians and contemporary readers food for thought in revisiting the past and finding a broader ambitus of tones in it. In its attempt to expand the reader's field of vision, this book will not use the geopolitical notion of the Central Eastern European region to define the GDL's political nation, the development of its culture, and its expansion in its geopolitical space. Instead, I invoke the metaphor *Between Rome and Byzantium* to describe this geopolitical and geocultural space because it reflects my effort to emphasize that the complex sociopolitical and sociocultural processes described below occurred at the crossroads of Western and Eastern civilization.

The perspective chosen for this study should not give the reader the impression that I intend to dissociate from the society and culture of the Kingdom of Poland and ignore the links that tied these two states and their societies together. The extent of contact among them was truly massive and left numerous tracks. I can only agree with the Lithuanian culture historian Ingė Lukšaitė that Lithuania's neighbor, the Kingdom of Poland, was one of the most influential participants in the interaction among cultures in Lithuania from the Middle Ages onward. At the beginning of the early modern period, the Lithuanian state was linked with the Kingdom by traditional dynastic ties, political connections, economic relations, cultural ties, and contacts among institutions, groups, and individuals, all having formed during the Middle Ages. After the Union of Lublin bound Lithuania and Poland together within the framework of the Commonwealth, these ties gathered strength and acquired new traits.[32] However, one should not forget that the process stirred by the dynastic union of these two states, established in 1386, was not a one-sided arrangement that led the societies and cultures of these two states down the path to unification and nothing else. The GDL's political nation, which brought together dukes, magnates and boyars, was unified and formed by joint sociopolitical and sociocultural aspirations and aims and a common historical and cultural memory and self-awareness. It had its own leaders and considered itself a partner of the Kingdom of Poland's political nation, not a community from a Polish province.

Alongside the aforementioned research on the political culture of the GDL in the Middle Ages and the early modern period, sundry monographs and articles examine important aspects of the issue at hand: its structure, society and the values it fostered, law, diplomacy, and parlimentarism, among other

---

32 See I. Lukšaitė, *Paveldėtosios ir kuriamos kultūros komunikacijos galimybės ir mastas*, in *Lietuvos istorija*, vol. 5, 487–500.

things. Their authors made observations about the GDL political culture from the second half of the fifteenth century to the first half of the seventeenth century, often using the same sources that gave me the opportunity to research this political culture, and provided their own interpretation. These works, along with their authors' observations, are used throughout this book.

The corpus of sources for the study that follows also comprises official acts of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania and the Kingdom of Poland, various types of political and diplomatic documents, legal codes, Sejm diaries and texts of laws discussed and proclaimed in them, instructions for envoys to the sejms that were discussed and written down by the sejmiks (district-level assemblies), political correspondence, diaries, and texts of publicistic, literary, or historiographic nature, as well as other sources of information about the political nation and its culture. Today, much of this cornucopia is not kept in Lithuania; many documents used in this study are kept in archives and libraries in Poland, Austria, and Russia. Research on political culture cannot be based only on newly discovered facts. One must also reread and reinterpret information from sources that other researchers have referenced repeatedly. This is essential for comparing and contrasting sources and historiographical observations to more fully understanding the spectrum of political culture.

In written sources and academic literature, we come up against the question of varying orthographies in personal and place names. Even the names of joint rulers of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania and the Kingdom of Poland are written differently in different sources and source languages. For example, the last scions of the Jagiellonian dynasty that ruled the Commonwealth before the introduction of electoral governance, Sigismund the Old and Sigismund the Augustus are known as Žygimantas Senasis and Žygimantas Augustas in Lithuanian and as Zygmunt I Stary and Zygmunt II August in Polish. The matter is hard to resolve because the sources from the time appear in various languages and present rulers with the same name in different orders, one in Lithuania and another in Poland. Families themselves wrote their first and last names differently depending on the language they were using. Thus we find families with three different orthographies—Radziwiłł in Polish, Radivil in Latin, and Radvila in Lithuanian. The variety of proper names of people and places is even larger for sources written with Cyrillic characters. I have tried in this study to modify existing systems of identifying these names to make them consistent with the rules of English.

One study cannot cover all aspects of a political culture and discuss the variety of all of its methods and forms of expression. A selection process is

needed, yielding the themes that best depict the unique nature of the political culture of the pluralistic GDL in the time frame chosen and most effectively explain its precipitants. I structured this monograph in consideration of the current state of research on and sources of the GDL's political culture. Thus, the book is comprised of three parts.

Part 1, "The Landscape of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania's Political Culture," describes the Lithuanian state, its size, borders, internal territorial structure, and the geopolitical and geocultural changes that these elements underwent from the second half of the fifteenth century to the first half of the seventeenth. I attempt to explain why the real-life state was endowed with mythical aspects that were created by the GDL's political culture. I also discuss the topography of GDL political power, showing where the beginnings of the nucleus of the political nation in this territorially massive state can be detected and examining the factors that strongly influenced this process and its consequences. I also uncover the formation and expansion of the political nation, specific aspects of its internal development, and the change that took place in its relations with other structures of rule, power, and political representation. The discussion yields a sociopolitical and sociocultural portrait of the boyar class, which created and fostered the political culture described. After the reader is acquainted with the geopolitical and geocultural space, time, and circumstances in which this political nation matured—a political nation that took responsibility for the Lithuanian state, fostered it, and defended it—he or she will find the mentality, values, and political behavior of the GDL's political nation easier to understand.

The core of this monograph is Part 2, "The Makeup and Manifestation of the Political Culture of the GDL." Here I examine the methods that the heterogeneous, class-based political nation of the GDL used to form its own brand of political culture and how this culture laid the foundation for the state's domestic and foreign relations. It seeks an answer to the question of what united the GDL's political nation.

This part of the book is comprised of three chapters. The first, titled "Union—the Idea and Reality of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania's Political Culture," concerns itself with the union with the Kingdom of Poland, which has been examined by many historians and may at first glance seem rather unrelated to political culture. This is no accident. The political nation's tie with the idea of the union and the comparison of Polish and Lithuanian interpretations and understanding of certain notions open the door to understanding why the road was so long and hard, bringing mutual understanding to the political

nations of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania and the Kingdom of Poland and the traces of this road in the mentality of the GDL's political nation.

The idea of Lithuanian state sovereignty and the efforts to bring it to fruition in legal, political, and ideological ways is discussed from various perspectives as an important sign of political culture in the chapter titled "The State in the Political and Legal Culture of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania." Here I examine how the representatives of the political nation collaborated with their rulers to create systems of rule, presentation, and defense of the state, and their everyday work for the nation's benefit in various spheres of public life. This chapter also shows the development of this process starting from its center, Vilnius, and then outward toward the GDL's periphery, where the local political community established itself and gathered strength as the broader classes of boyars became part of the state's political life.

The third chapter in Part 2, "The GDL's Culture of Parliamentarism," deals with the creation of institutions that fostered the culture described earlier—the sejms and the sejmiks, their values and ways these values were implemented, the results achieved, and the failures experienced. This chapter also shows how the culture of parliamentarism encompassed the entirety of the boyars' public life, forming a unique civic society within the GDL and becoming an inseparable part of the Duchy's political culture.

Part 3, "We, the Nation of Lithuania—Uncovering the Values of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania's Political Culture," serves as a coda to this book, as it shows in detail what kind of political values the GDL's political nation cherished and fostered. It also touches upon how this nation understood the concepts of "state," "homeland," "love of homeland," and "patriotism."

THE LANDSCAPE OF THE GRAND DUCHY OF LITHUANIA'S POLITICAL CULTURE

PART I

The political culture of each epoch is born, matures, and flourishes in a specified geopolitical and geocultural space that is inhabited by the individuals and societies that created it. It is brought into being by the politically active stratum of its society, one whose size and makeup depend on many elements. An important role belongs to a social environment formed by historical circumstance, a space where sociopolitical and sociocultural processes greatly impact the content of this political culture and shape its expression. This is how I understand the term "landscape of political culture" and so I will use it in this study.

As they strive to achieve their geopolitical and sociopolitical goals, the founders and nurturers of every political culture attempt to change the structure of space. Contemporary historiography explores the issues of political landscapes in multitudinous ways.[1] Until now, however, the Grand Duchy of Lithuania and the diverse forms and processes that shaped its political nation and culture have not been examined in depth and have remained outside the scope of comparative studies in Europe.[2] The most significant contribution to such an examination is found in a monograph by Zenonas Norkus, who examines the maturing Lithuanian state in the context of Eastern and Central

---

1 The latest research trends and approaches, and the possibilities of realizing them, are discussed in *Political Space in Pre-industrial Europe*, ed. Beat Kümin, preface by James C. Scott (Farnham: Ashgate, 2009). One question discussed in the book is whether the concept of "space" as various places of space can be understood and used as a new instrument in research on political history (Introduction, 5–15).

2 A collection of articles devoted to comparative studies on Medieval Eastern and Western Latin Europe, *Grenzräume und Grenzüberschreitungen im Vergleich. Der Osten und der Westen des mittelalterlichen Lateineuropa,* ed. Klaus Herbers and Nikolas Jaspert (Oldenburg: Akademie Verlag, 2007). Christiane Schiller's contribution to the collection, "Sprachen im Grenzraum. Sprachverhältnisse im Großfürstentum Litauen" (279–290), is devoted exclusively to discussion of the space of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania in terms of the languages used and spoken there. The compilers and authors of the collection *Litauen und Ruthenien. Studien zur einer transkulturellen Kommunikationsregion (15.–18. Jahrhundert) / Lithuania and Ruthenia. Studies of a Transcultural Communication Zone (Fifteenth–Eighteenth Centuries),* ed. Stefan Rohdewald, David Frick, and Stefan Wiederkehr (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag, 2007) set themselves the goal of examining the intercultural and interconfessional processes of integration in the Grand Duchy of Lithuania and the eastern territories of the Kingdom of Poland in the late Middle Ages and the early modern era. They do not, however, cover the problem of cultural communication. For more on the compilers' position, see Rohdewald, Wiederkehr, and Frick, "Transkulturelle Kommunikation im Großfüstentum Litauen und in den östlichen Gebieten der Polnischen Krone: Zur Einführung" (ibid., 7–33).

Europe and its links with the changing geopolitical and geocultural space of the region.[3]

Historiography says that the Grand Duchy of Lithuania's political cultural landscape did not yet have a clear, recognizable shape between the second half of the fifteenth century and the first half of the seventeenth century. Yet a geopolitical and geocultural landscape did exist and I describe it below, illuminating the most important internal traits of the development of this country's space and its place in the region. I will investigate the Central and East European geopolitical and geocultural environment in which the Lithuanian state took shape from the Middle Ages until the first half of seventeenth century and show how it impacted the community that formed the Duchy's political culture, the process that transformed this community into a political nation, and the most characteristic traits of the community's sociopolitical and sociocultural portrait. Finally, I will discuss the mythological space of the Lithuanian state that this political nation created, the creators' aims and aspirations, and the fate of this legendary tale in historical and cultural memory.

---

3 Z. Norkus, *Nepasiskelbusioji imperija. Lietuvos Didžioji Kunigaikštija lyginamosios istorinės imperijų sociologijos požiūriu* (Vilnius: Aidai, 2009), 428–447; see also Z. Norkus, "The Grand Duchy of Lithuania in the Retrospective of Comparative Historical Sociology of Empires," *World Political Science Review* 3, no. 4 (2007): 1–41.

1

The Geopolitical and Geocultural Space of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania

A country's territory is not just a piece of land demarcated by "Frontier Ahead" signs. It is a geopolitical and geocultural space that formed in a specific place. When the space changes, so does the country. This process of change is greatly impacted by the historical region and environment in which the country established itself and exists.

Historians trace the initial formation of Lithuania's political space to the turn of the thirteenth century. It was then that what had been the plundering of armies evolved into deliberate political action as political units inherited from earlier tribal organization attained consolidation and strength. The institution of warrior-leaders in the Lithuanian lands developed so briskly during that time that by then the leaders entrenched their own permanent political rule and became dukes of these lands. King Mindaugas of Lithuania (crowned in 1253) emerged from this collectivity, and it was in his and his family's hands that all levers of reform in the Lithuanian lands were first gathered—mechanisms that other Lithuanian medieval rulers would later use. It was also in the thirteenth century that Mindaugas and his family discovered tools that allowed them to unite these territories into a Lithuanian state and consolidate the monarch's control. Concurrently, territorial expansion of the Lithuanian state got under way as monarchial rule, steadily gaining strength, began to widen its military and political foothold in lands that bordered their ethnic territory. Thus, the thirteenth century is the time when the objectives and borders of the future Grand Duchy of Lithuania began to emerge.[1]

---

1 For more information, see S. C. Rowell, *Lithuania Ascending: a Pagan Empire within East-Central Europe, 1295–1345* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994); S. C. Rowell, *Iš viduramžių ūkų kylanti Lietuva. Pagonių imperija Rytų ir Vidurio Europoje, 1295–1345*, transl. Osvaldas Aleksa (Vilnius: Baltos lankos, 2001); E. Gudavičius, *Mindaugas* (Vilnius: Žara, 1998); E. Gudavičius, *Lietuvos istorija nuoseniausių laikų iki 1569 metų* (Vilnius: Lietuvos Rašytojų sąjungos leidykla, 1999); Z. Norkus, *Nepasiskelbusioji imperija*; *Lietuvos istorija,*

Once the Lithuanian state became a member of the international community of Central and Eastern Europe, as happened during the Middle Ages, it came up against widely different political entities that surrounded it. The new monarchy had to defend itself against the expansion of outside forces and was able to capitalize on opportunities that became available to them concerning the expansion of their territory. The first question to answer is how the Gediminid dynasty[2] as well as the Lithuanian magnates and nobility that supported it, were able to integrate into the region's political life during the Middle Ages.[3]

Lithuania's contact with the Christian[4] West broke open at the turn of the thirteenth century when the Teutonic Order, associated with the Crusade movement that had arisen in Western Europe in the late the eleventh century, reached the lands near the Baltic Sea, marking Lithuania's first direct contact with a Christian state from the West. Lithuania would long remain in

---

vol. 3, ed. D. Baronas, A. Dubonis, and R. Petrauskas: *XIII a.–1385. Valstybės iškilimas tarp Rytų ir Vakarų* (Vilnius: Baltos lankos, 2011).

2 In fall 1263, Mindaugas was assassinated together his two sons, and an interregnum followed. At the end of the thirteenth century, Lithuania was ruled by the princes who initiated Gediminid dynasty. The name is derived from Gediminas, who was perhaps the third ruler (1316–1341) in this family. It is not known how the first, Pukuveras (Budvydas), acquired power, nor is the origin of the family itself quite clear. It is agreed that the Gediminids originated in the land of Lithuania, with later sources mentioning their forefather Skalmantas, who may have lived in Mindaugas's time: they also allude to a Mindaugas, Traidenis, and Gediminid kinship. The Gediminids inherited the state as it had been under Mindaugas and Traidenis, with all of its achievements and problems. See Z. Kiaupa, *The History of Lithuania*, transl. S. C. Rowell, Jonathan Smith, and Vida Urbonavičius; special editor S. C. Rowell (Vilnius: Baltos lankos, 2002), 39.

3 The discussion that follows is based on the most recent insights of Lithuanian historians: *Lietuvos istorija*, vol. 3; *Lietuvos istorija*, vol. 4, *Lietuvos istorija*, vol. 5, *Lietuvos istorija*, vol. 6. Short version in English: Z. Kiaupa, J. Kiaupienė, and A. Kuncevičius, *The History of Lithuania before 1795*, English translation edited by Milda Danytė and Nijolė Borges (Vilnius: Arlila Press, 2000); Kiaupa, *The History of Lithuania*.

4 The twelfth-century Lithuania had a developed pagan religious system that can be defined as providing a separate religious identity. The spiritual world of early Lithuanians, their mythical world, attitudes and belief, their relation with natural powers, phenomena, and objects and their customs have not yet been systematically studied, particularly in terms of their evolution over the course of centuries. Lithuanians saw the world as consisting of three spheres: water (the underworld), earth, and heaven. To some extent this world-view also influenced the Lithianians' attitude to life and death. In the following two centuries the Lithuanians developed a hierarchy of personified deities with particular spheres of action. See: Kiaupa, Kiaupienė, and Kuncevičius, *The History of Lithuania before 1795*, 93–95.

the zone of the Order's military territorial expansion. Its constant wars with the Order had an immense influence all spheres of the life of society and the state. Each state entity in this ongoing conflict—the Order and the Grand Duchy of Lithuania—created its own brand of military ideology. However, as often happens in history, these perennial clashes brought the conflicting sides to reconciliation. Personal ties took shape among the leaders of neighboring countries in a period of long-lasting war. In Lithuania, it was Mindaugas who took the first step in developing these relations. Having agreed with the Master of the Livonian Order, a branch of the Teutonic Order, on issues of mutual importance, Mindaugas agreed to be baptized and accept the king's crown from the Pope, with the Master serving as the intermediary.[5] After being baptized in 1251, Mindaugas became the last king of the Latin world in Europe to be crowned during the Middle Ages. After Mindaugas was murdered in 1263, Lithuania under Gediminas continued its relations with the Teutonic Order, while still not adopting Chtistianity as its official religion. It was with the Order that Lithuania signed its first international treaties in 1323 and 1338. From then on, peace negotiations and agreements became a regular part of the diplomacy of both countries. Evidence of this are the peace treaties of 1367, 1379, 1380, and 1382, that were executed between the Order and the Lithuanian dukes before the country's official conversion to Christianity in 1387.[6]

During the country's wars with the Teutonic Order, the Lithuanian political elite also changed, gradually beginning to assimilate elements of the

---

5 Mindaugas established contacts with Innocent IV when his envoys, accompanied by Teutonic Knights, were received by the Pope in Milan in July 1251. The news was good: a ruler on the far eastern marches of Latin Europe had received baptism. On this occasion the Pope issued six bulls that showed how it was planned to introduce Christianity into Lithuania, and how natural law should be supplanted by the Law based on divine authority. Acceding to Mindaugas's own request, the Pope declared him a special son of the Church, and took him, his family, and his posseśions under papal protection. For more details, see the forthcoming book: Darius Baronas, S. C. Rowell, *The Conversion of Lithuania. From Pagan Barbarians to Late Medieval Christinians* (Vilnius: The Institute of Lithuanian literature and Folklore, n.d.), 79.

6 During the thirteenth and especially the fourteenth century, Christians dwelt in Lithuanian society—captive wetnurses, merchants, and their pastors, Franciscan missionaries. Lithuanians, especially members of the leading families and even courtiers, accepted Chrsitianity and were allowed to practice their religion as long as they accepted their duty to behave as the grand duke and native custom required. The latter institutions were not as rigid as to preclude any innovation and the pagans themselves did not constitute a monolithic block of "heathendom." That is why the penetration of Christianity within pagan society was evident long before the official conversion. See: Baronas, Rowell, *The Conversion of Lithuania*, 520.

Western court and knight culture and amassing new experience in running the country and representing it abroad. By the end of the fourteenth century, the political elite of Lithuania's nobility and the leadership of the Teutonic Order were increasingly bound together a common world of chivalry, customs of war and peace, and codes of ethics. What developed from this were new forms of war, peaceful coexistence, and a system that bound both sides to certain rules: chivalric duels, a code of conduct for prisoners of war, and trade conditions, *inter alia*.

Lithuania's state relations with the Teutonic Order began to change in the first half of the fifteenth century as the country enjoyed both military victory (in the Battle of Žalgiris in 1410) and diplomatic success (at the Council of Constance in 1414–1418). New opportunites to expand and strengthen peaceful bilateral relations opened up. In the second half of the fifteenth century, the holdings of the Teutonic Order and the Livonian Order began to change substantively. The internal conflict that emerged here was exploited by the Kingdom of Poland. After a military conflict between Poland and the Teutonic Order in 1454–1461, the Teutonic Order's state was partitioned with the signing of the Second Peace of Torun in 1466. Its western part became a vassal of Poland and began to be called Royal Prussia. The eastern sector bordered on the Grand Duchy of Lithuania; although it was also a vassal of the Kingdom of Poland, it possessed more autonomy than the western segment enjoyed. The independent activity of Lithuanian nobles in this area of international politics is already visible at this time. The joint interests of peace and stability induced the neighboring countries' officials to reach out to each other.

Lithuania's ties with the Teutonic Order took on a new important dimension under Grand Duke Alexander at the end of the fifteenth and beginning of the sixteenth centuries. The Teutonic Order and, especially, its branch in Livonia became a potential ally of the Grand Duchy in its wars with Moscow. The dissolution of the Catholic state of the Teutonic Order in 1525 and its transformation into a Protestant and secular state, the Duchy of Prussia, which became a Polish crown fiefdom, held great significance for the development of the GDL's political culture.[7] A new and quickly modernizing state had materialized right up against the borders of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania. The historical area known as Lithuania Minor, or as Prussian Lithuania (*Klein Litau, Klein Litauen, Preussisch-Litauen*), formed during the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries as part of the Duchy of Prussia along the Prussian-Lithuanian border.

---

7 The Teutonic Order survived only in lands of the Holy Roman Empire and Livonia.

Most of its inhabitants were descendents of Baltic tribes, including some of Lithuanian origin. The development of the Duchy of Prussia corresponds to the European trends that unfolded in the early modern period. Sharing its entire southwestern border with this duchy, the now-Catholic Lithuania became the neighbor of a Protestant country. Later on, another Protestant duchy, that of Courland, formed along Lithuania's northern border.

In the sixteenth century, due to its various ties with Central Europe, the society of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania reacted rather quickly to the Reformation that had begun in the German lands of the Holy Roman Empire and in Royal and Ducal Prussia. However, the Polish kings and the Lithuanian grand dukes, Sigismund the Old and Sigismund Augustus, did not convert to Protestantism. The primary trait of the Reformation that manifested in Lithuania in first half of the sixteenth century was its lack of support from the monarch's government, for which reason Protestantism did not become a state religion. The Reformation made inroads in the Grand Duchy of Lithuania but did so due to changes in society and its cultural impact. For Lithuanians who embraced Protestantism, who included prominent as well as more run-of-the-mill participants in the political nation, the new church's reformed teachings, and the need to modernize in the cultural sphere were accepted en bloc.[8]

Exploiting the political and religious break-up of Livonia in the middle of the sixteenth century, Lithuania took control of new territories near the Baltic Sea. This broadened the Grand Duchy's contacts with Europe into new domains of Renaissance culture and the Reformation. In foreign policy, however, it pulled the country into a new international conflict, starting in 1558 and lasting many years, over control of Livonia and domination of the shores of the Baltic Sea—the latter leading to several lengthy wars.

The neighboring Catholic lands of Poland were other areas in the sphere of Western Christian culture that Lithuania came into contact with. In the thirteenth to fifteenth centuries, Lithuanian-Polish relations saw both confrontations due to territorial claims as well as cooperation in the cultural, economical, religious, and political spheres. In 1386, the Lithuanian Grand Duke Jogaila introduced fundamental religious and political changes through his marriage to the Jadwiga of the House of Anjou, who had just inherited the Polish throne,

---

8 See I. Lukšaitė, *Reformacija Lietuvos Didžiojoje Kunigaikštystėje ir Mažojoje Lietuvoje. XVI a. trečias dešimtmetis—XVII a. pirmas dešimtmetis* (Vilnius: Baltos lankos, 1999); Ingė Lukšaitė, "Die reformatorischen Kirchen Litauens bis 1795," in *Die reformatorischen Kirchen Litauens*, ed. Arthur Hermann and Wilhelm Kahle (Erlangen: Martin-Luther-Verlag, 1998), 19–135.

as Władysław II Jagiełło. This marriage that laid the foundation for the union of the two countries and, with Jogaila's baptism, converted pagan Lithuania and Samogitia to Catholicism (in 1387 and 1413, respectively). In 1392, by way of an agreement (made official in 1401), Jogaila's cousin Vytautas became the Grand Duke of Lithuania. Władysław II Jagiełło retained the title of Supreme Duke of Lithuania as well as patrimonial rights, for himself and his descendants, to the Lithuanian state. By the turn of the fifteenth century, the area ruled by the Gediminid-Jagiellonian dynasty in Central and Eastern Europe was growing in size and prestige. The dynastic union stimulated the development of contacts between the magnates and nobility of the Grand Duchy and the Kingdom of Poland and endowed them with new traits.[9] However, the Duchy and the Kingdom remained independent states until the 1569, when they were linked by joint rulers. Before this, their political nations were drawn together mostly by common military and political interests.

So it happened that a new political creature made its appearance in Europe in 1569—the Commonwealth of the Two Nations, a composite state comprised of the Kingdom of Poland and the Grand Duchy of Lithuania. Ordained by the Union of Lublin, it came about as a mutual initiative of the two states. For Lithuania, this was a chance to counteract the threat posed by Muscovy's military expansion toward the Rus' lands that were under Lithuanian control. However, the union reduced the territory that remained Lithuanian in the newly created composite state almost by half. This occurred because the southern Lithuanian territories (the Volhynia, Podlasia, and Kyiv palatinates) were separated from Lithuania by the power of the Polish King and Lithuanian Grand Duke Sigismund Augustus, and by that of the Polish Sejm, in the negotiations that built up to the renewal of the Lithuanian-Polish union and the changing of its conditions. By decree of Sigismund Augustus, they were joined to the Kingdom of Poland.[10] On March 5, 1569, in the Lublin

---

9 For a more detailed discussion about the union of Poland and Lithuania, the shifting of its forms, and its impact on the political culture of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania, see art 2 below, "Union—the Idea and Reality of the Political Culture of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania."

10 For more on this, see J. Kiaupienė, "Lietuvos Didžiosios Kunigaikštystės teritorinio vientisumo suardymo 1569 m. problema Liublino unijos istoriografijos kontekste: tradicijų ir naujų interpretacijų erdvė" / "Problem rozbicia jedności terytorialnej Wielkiego Kisęstwa Litewskiego w 1569 roku w kontekście historiografii poświęconej unii lubelskiej: tradycje i nowe interpretacje," in *Liublino unija: idėja ir jos tęstinumas / Unia lubelska: idea i jej kontynuacja*, ed. Liudas Glemža and Ramunė Šmigelskytė-Stukienė (Vilnius: Nacionalinis muziejus Lietuvos Didžiosios Kunigaikštystės valdovų rūmai, 2011), 102–113; 114–125.

Sejm—without the participation of the representatives of the Grand Duchy's Sejm—Sigismund Augustus declared that the Podlasia and Volhynia palatinates would be taken from the Grand Duchy of Lithuania and annexed to the Kingdom of Poland. He based his edict on Poland's historical claims to these lands. Where the Podlasia Palatinate was concerned, the king used the idea originated by the Polish historian Martin Kromer, who suggested that Podlasia had originally been a Polish domain.[11]

> The land of Podlasia, which had belonged entirely and lawfully to the Polish Crown since time immemorial, we hereby return to this Crown, that of the Kingdom of Poland, and incorporate it into its initial whole. Then we, remembering our oath, to which we personally bind all citizens of the Kingdom, that all parts torn away or separated from the above-mentioned Kingdom, as much as our strength allows, we will regain and return to the whole of the aforementioned Kingdom, knowing full well, that the land of Podlasia with its eternally perfect right even before our grandfather, King Władysław Jagiełło and throughout his reign, also that of the reign of his son, our great-uncle Władysław, belonged to the Polish Crown, which later the Holy King, our grandfather Casimir, once ruler of both nations, separated from the part of the Kingdom, that is from Mazovia, and torn from its body, wished to possess but resisted this and did not allow the estate of the Crown to do it, which [the Crown] also never ceased to demand of our grandfather, as of those other forefathers of course, the kings of Poland and grand dukes of Lithuania, who had ruled after him, also us because of that land, that it would be returned to the Crown. …that land to the Crown of Poland, also to the rightful and true body and mind, to the community, to the part, we have also decided to return our property and title to the Crown, even to its original place, and to join them together.[12]

---

11 Martin Kromer (Polish: Marcin Kromer, Latin: Martinus Cromerus, 1512–1589) was Prince Bishop of Warmia (Emland), a Polish diplomat and historian in the Kingdom of Poland and later in Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth. He was personal secretary to two Kings of Poland, Sigismund I the Old and Sigismund II Augustus. His work as a historian was supported by king Sigismund Augustus. Kromer personally did not participate in 1569 Lublin Sejm.

12 Cited on the basis of Dorota Michaluk, "Palenkės inkorporavimas į Lenkijos Karalystę 1569 metais" / "Inkorporacja Podlasia do Korony Królestwa Polskiego w 1569 roku," in *Liublino unija: idėja ir tęstinumas*, 135. The original document is published in Polish: *Akta Unji Polski z Litwą 1385–1791*, ed. Stanisław Kutrzeba and Władysław Semkowicz (Kraków: Polska

Sigismund Augustus's historical claims were undoubtedly just one more propaganda tool. More important is that his decision on this centuries-long controversy brought him into the camp of one of the two states that he ruled, namely, the political society of the Kingdom of Poland, in disregard of his obligation to his patrimonial state, the Grand Duchy of Lithuania, and his ducal oath not to reduce its territory, a commitment which was included in all the privileges and in the Lithuanian Statute. Sigismund Augustus disregarded the promise made by his father, the Lithuanian Grand Duke Sigismund the Old, recorded in the First Lithuanian Statute in 1529 (Section III, Article 2) and repeated in the Second Lithuanian Statute in 1566, "not to reduce the wealth of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania, but that which will be unlawfully ripped away and improperly taken as well as cajoled, will become the property of the Duchy."

At the demand of the Polish Sejm, Sigismund Augustus decided to undermine the opposition of the Lithuanian side by a unilateral act, directed against Lithuanian's territorial autonomy and state sovereignty. By the royal decrees of 1569, the palatinates of Volynia and Podlasia, which had more supporters of the union with Poland than elsewhere, and, later, Podolia, Bratslav, and Kyiv, all formerly under GDL's dominion, were annexed to Poland.

By the power of the Lithuanian Grand Duke and the Sejm of the Kingdom of Poland, the territorial integrity and state sovereignty of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania were shattered even before the negotiations over renewing the terms of the union had ended. In the eyes of the Lithuanian nobility, Sigismund Augustus conspired with the Polish Sejm to weaken the political prestige of the patrimonial state of the Gediminid-Jagiellonian dynasty, in disregard of Lithuanian statehood and the entire nation of the nobles. This action affected the magnates, who were the leaders in the state's political life, as well as ordinary nobles, who felt responsible for their country's fate. In protest, the GDL delegation drew out of Lublin. However, Poland was still a major military threat for Lithuania. The GDL politicians had to solve a major dilemma: to start another war and in fact to rebel against the rule of their Grand Duke Sigismund Augustus, or to support the union.[13] The political nation of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania, mulling the situation that it had created and remaining mindful of

---

Akademia Umiejętności, 1932), no. 97: "Zygmunt August król polski i wielki książę litewski przywraca i wciela do Korony polskiej Podlasie i określa dokładnie warunki tego wcielenia" (196–207). For Interpretations by a modern British historian of the problem see: Robert I. Frost, *The Oxford History of Poland-Lithuania*, vol. 1: *The Making of the Polish-Lithuanian Union, 1385-1569* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2015), 481–486.

13 Kiaupa, Kiaupienė, and Kuncevičius, *The History of Lithuania before 1795*, 237.

the military tension in the region, decided that a delegation of the Lithuanian Sejm would return to Lublin nd continue the parliamentary struggle.[14]

From the end of the fourteenth century to the middle of the sixteenth century, the decisions made by the Gediminid dynasty and the political elite that supported them demonstrate that the Catholic segment of Lithuanian society— the element that ruled the Lithuanian state—had chosen to integrate into the political and culture sphere of the Christian West. However, the Catholics were not alone in Lithuania; much of the Grand Duchy's population embraced the Orthodox confession. Historical circumstances fated Lithuania to border on the Orthodox duchies of ancient Rus' in the northeast. It was there that the geocultural area based on Eastern Christianity began to expand in the early Middle Ages, the Eastern Orthodox church in Rus' forming a strong union with the state church and laying foundations for its own identity, culture, and society. In the first half of the thirteenth century, Mongol and Tatar invasions of Eastern Europe marked the beginning of a new period in the history of Rus'. Kievan Rus' splintered into several separate duchies, several of which fell under Mongol and Tatar control. The Mongolian khan became the most important ruler of the duchies of Rus'. Later, after the Mongolian Empire broke up, the khan of the Golden Horde succeeded him. Most of the other Ruthenian duchies were annexed by the Grand Duchy of Lithuania, starting in the thirteenth century and through the period of the Mongol invasion Historians believe that while the Mongolians and Tatars were conquering the lands of the Rus' in the first half of the thirteenth century, they may have reached Lithuania and became the first Muslims with whom Lithuanians had direct contact. Be this as it may, the Lithuanians did not attempt to fight the Tatars, instead striving to use the Tatars' victories against Rus' to bolster their own territorial expansion in that country.

Another objective of the Grand Duchy's territorial expansion in the Middle Ages led the Lithuanian forces south, toward the shores of the Black Sea. The vast steppes that stretched between the Dniepr and Dniester rivers became the object of territorial division between Lithuanian rulers and the khans of the Tatar hordes. At the end of the fourteenth century and into the fifteenth, these territories came under the economic and military sway of the Lithuanian state. The Lithuanians' contact with the culture of the Muslim Tatars and, later, the Turks, gave the country new experiences in regional military and diplomatic behavior.

---

14   For more about this, see Chapter 5, "The Culture of Parliamentarism in the Grand Duchy of Lithuania" in Part 2 of this book.

The medieval territorial expansion of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania, a deliberate policy on the part of the ruling dynasty in the second half of the thirteenth century, was continued by later Lithuanian rulers. In the first half of the fifteenth century, during the reign of Vytautas, the political reach of the Duchy attained its territorial apex—as much as a million square kilometers by the end of Vytautas's reign. However, the Golden Horde, a political body created by the Mongols and the Tatars, began to disintegrate at this time. This meant the downfall of the regional interpolitical order that had existed until that point, in which the Golden Horde was suzerain. The second half of the fifteenth century saw the formation of a polycentric state system in its stead. The advent of this new order was associated with changes in Tatar-ruled Rus'. In the second half of the fourteenth century, the Duchy of Muscovy began to liberate itself from Tatar rule by consolidating its hold on the ancient Ruthenian lands. Once the Muscovite dukes staked claims to all lands of Kievan Rus', a military conflict with the Grand Duchy of Lithuania was to be expected. Attempts to stave it off through diplomatic channels were made. Thus, in 1449, the Polish King and Lithuanian Grand Duke Casimir signed an agreement with the Muscovite Grand Duke Vasily II, in which Lithuania essentially renounced territorial expansion into lands of the Rus'. The GDL focused instead on preserving the old lands of Rus' that had already been under the Lithuanian dominion.

The new polycentric regional system of states that formed in the middle of the fifteenth century was comprised of the following: the Grand Duchy of Lithuania, the Grand Duchy of Moscow, the Turkish Ottoman Empire, and the products of the fragmentation of the Golden Horde—the Great Horde, the Crimean Khanate, the Khanate of Kazan, and other short-lived political bodies in the steppes, as well as Rus' lands that had not been included in the makeup of the Lithuanian state and were at least nominally not yet adjoined to Russia at the beginning of the period under discussion (Tver', Novgorod, Pskov, and Riazan').[15]

This is how this East European region looked in the middle of the fifteenth century—a multifaceted ethno-confessional and ethno-cultural area made of various political bodies that were inherited from the Middle Ages. Great changes in this region were about to begin.

The occupation of Constantinople, capital of the Byzantine Empire, in 1453 is a symbolic landmark in European history because it portended the Muslim Turks' expansion of the Ottoman Empire into Christendom. The fall

---

15 Norkus, *Nepasiskelbusioji imperija*, 252, 311.

of the Byzantine Empire bore witness to the fact that a center that had disseminated and fostered the universal ideas of antiquity had disappeared for good. It matters not that during the period under discussion, Byzantium was a small country that wielded no geopolitical influence and that its collapse had been predicted by commentators at the time. The conquest of Constantinople, whence Orthodox Christianity had derived an ideological strength that was recognized all over the Christian world, and the transformation of the city into Istanbul, capital of the Ottoman Empire, sent powerful waves of change across all geopolitical and geocultural crossroads of these civilizations.

Importantly for our area of concern—the Grand Duchy of Lithuania's political culture—the fall of Constantinople opened the door to the emergence of a new center for the Orthodox world, Moscow. In the 1490s, Moscow stood at a new precipice of history. Its ruler, Ivan III, attempted to amplify the reputation of Rus' as a powerful kingdom by taking symbolic and ideological measures that accorded with Moscow's growing power. One may agree with Norman Davies that one can hardly overestimate the prestige that the Orthodox Grand Duke Ivan III, ruler of Moscow at the time of the fall of Byzantium but little known in Catholic Europe, had acquired through his 1472 marriage to Sofia, niece of the Byzantine Emperor and descendent of the Palaiologos dynasty, which was under Papal care after the catastrophe of Constantinople's downfall in 1453. This conjugal tie with the Byzantine imperial dynasty gave Ivan III additional symbolic strength with which to spread the mighty Orthodox Rus' myth that the two of them were creating. The most important part of this myth was Moscow as the new Constantinople and Muscovy's grand duke as the ruler of All of Rus' and the successor to Constantine the Great, founder of Constantinople.

So it was that, in 1492, Moscow was called the "Third Rome" for the first time. The essence of the Moscow-as-third-Rome doctrine is the concept of *translatio imperii* that Byzantium had adopted. In this construction, the first emperor (Constantine the Great) was a Christian who had moved his capital from ancient Rome to the "New Rome" of Constantinople. Now that the Turks had conquered Constantinople, Moscow proclaimed itself the new center. According to historical narratives written in Moscow at the turn of the sixteenth century, the rule of the Muscovite grand dukes emanated not only from Constantinople but from Rome as well, as Augustus was the tsar (emperor) of the entire world. It was declared by Moscow that the fall of Constantinople had brought the history of the Byzantine Empire to an end: not only had the rule of the Byzantine state collapsed but so had the authority of the Patriarch

of Constantinople, which had now metamorphosed into Muslim Istanbul. The Muscovite grand duke proclaimed himself, with the support of the Orthodox Church, the sole sovereign of the Orthodox world, spreading the belief that he was to receive the status of Emperor of Byzantium and recognition as God's chosen ruler of the Eastern Christian lands. Thus Moscow began to disseminate the myth of the "Third Rome." Ivan III, his successors, his courtiers, and in particular, the Russian Orthodox Church successfully employed the political theory of the Byzantine Empire for their ideological exigencies. In the Muscovite state, as had been the case in the Byzantine Empire, the emperor and the patriarch of the Orthodox Church were understood as two equal pillars (one secular, the other ecclesiastical) of God's kingdom on earth, and the State and the Church were imagined as an inseparable whole.[16]

However, they needed time and effort to transform the theory into reality. In 1453, after the Ottoman conquest of Constantinople, the organizational shape of the Orthodox Church changed markedly as the Patriarch of Constantinople recognized the rule of the Ottoman sultan. In Moscow, this was understood as the loss of the powers and rights that had belonged to the old center of the Byzantine Empire. Moscow, on the other hand, as the center of political, spiritual and ecclesiastical life, still fostered the Byzantine spirit and its cultural values, which had been preserved even when Muscovy was subordinate to the Tatars. Thus, the Russian Orthodox Church began to struggle for recognition of its independence. It succeeded: in the 1590s, the Muscovite patriarch became independent of Constantinople. This ideology would undergo constant improvement and dissemination until it became the

---

16 For more, see N. Davies, *Europe. A History*, reprinted with corrections (London: Pimlico, 1997), 446–468; M. Pliukhanova, *Siuzhety i simvoly Moskovskogo tsarstva* (Saint-Petersburg: Akropol', 1995); Boris Uspenskij and Victor Zhivov, *"Tsar and God" and other Essays in Russian Cultural Semiotics*, trans. Marcus C. Levitt, David Budgen, and Liv Bliss, ed. Marcus C. Levit (Boston: Academic Studies Press, 2012); Nina Sinitsyna, *Tretii Rim. Istoki i evoliutsiia russkoi srednevekovoi kontseptsii (XV–XVI vv.)* (Moscow: Indrik, 1998); István Ferincz, "Litovskie kniaz´ia i teoriia 'Moskva— tretiĭ Rim,'" in *Studia Russica* 18 (2000), 59–64; Tatiana Oparina, "Moskva kak novyi Kiev, ili gde zhe proizoshlo kreshchenie Rusi: vzgliad iz pervoi poloviny XVII veka," in *Istoria i pamiat´: istoricheskaia kul'tura Evropy do nachala Novogo vremeni*, ed. L. P. Repina (Moscow: Krug, 2006); A. S. Usachev, "Tretii Rim ili Tretii Kiev? (Moskovskoe tsarstvo XVI veka v vospriatii sovremennikov)," in *Obshchestvennye nauki i sovremennost´* 1 (2012), accessed August 29, 2016, ecsosman. hs.ru/data/2015/04/05/125118835/Usachyov.pdf; Sergii Plokhy, *The Origins of the Slavic nations. Premodern Identities in Russia, Ukraine, and Belarus* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006), 122–160 (chapter "The rise of Moscovy").

long-standing foundation of the political concept first of Moscow and then, gradually, of Russia.

By then—during the fifteenth century—the geopolitical attitude of the Muscovite rulers had changed markedly. They began to implement their claims to bring all the lands of ancient Rus′ under their control, including the districts that remained under Lithuanian domain afrer GDL's renunciation. The Muscovites' conduct brought them into renewed military conflict with the Grand Duchy of Lithuania. By the end of that century, after wars with Moscow concerning the eastern territories began, and the Lithuanian state started to lose territory. Thus, its relations with Moscow affected not only the military and diplomatic situation but also, and powerfully, the territorial disposition of the region. In terms of political culture, it is important to understand the effect of the new geopolitical situation in the region, brought on by these conflicts, on the mentality of the people there, what signs the losses and victories in the wars with Moscow over the lands of ancient Rus′ remained in the pluralistic ethnoconfessional spirit of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania, and what effect these events had on the development of religious, secular, and national identities.

To attain the goals of its struggle against Lithuania, Moscow needed more than just weapons. In a Moscow that was growing in strength in the fifteenth century, striving to become the united new center all of Rus′, it was equally important to tie into the ideological heritage of Kyiv as the cradle of medieval Rus′ Orthodoxy.[17] Ancient Rus′ texts emphasize the sacred nature of that city, terming it a place that enjoys the special protection of God (*bogospasaemyi / bogokhranimyi*) and one destined to be "the metropolis of all cities of Rus′" (*Se budi mati gradom rus′skim*). Indeed, Saint Sophia's Cathedral in Kyiv was called by its contemporaries the mother/head of all Rus′ churches" (*matir′iu / glavoiu vsim rus′kim tserkvam*). The special status of Kyiv in the mentality of Orthodox believers in Rus′ is borne witness by the saying that "Kyiv is a second Jerusalem" (*Kyiv—drygii Erusalim*). In the first half of the thirteenth century, however, the Grand Duchy of Kyiv, destroyed by the Mongols, lost its independent position

---

17 See Nina Sinitsyna, *Tretii Rim*; Natalia Iakovenko, "Simvol ʻbogokhranimogo gradaʼ u pamiatkakh kiivs′kogo kola (1620–1640-vi roki)," in Natalia Iakovenko, *Paralel′nyi svit. Doslidzhennia z istorii uiavlen′ta idei v Ukraini XVI-XVII st.* (Kyiv: Krytyka, 2002), 296–330; Olena Rusina, "Kyiv iak sankta civitas u Moskovs′kii ideologii ta politichni praktitsi XIV–XVI st.," in Olena Rusina, *Studii z istorii Kyeva ta Kyivs′koi zemli* (Kyiv: Instytut Istorii Ukrainy NAN Ukrainy, 2005), 172–199; Plokhy, *The Origins of the Slavic nations*, 6–9. A comprehensive bibliography of research on the issue is provided in Iakovenko, *Paralel′nyi svit*.

in the region between the Tatars and Lithuania and was joined to the Grand Duchy of Lithuania. At the turn of the fourteenth century, the metropol of the Orthodox Church moved from Kyiv to Vladimir and many high-ranking priests along with much of the laity left. For Orthodox believers in the lands of ancient Rus′ who lived both in the Grand Duchy of Lithuania and in the areas of Rus′ that Muscovite dukes were stitching together, however, Kyiv retained its sacred and unifying symbolic place in historical memory. The monarchs of Moscow at this time strove to push Kyiv out of society's collective mind and to minimize its spiritual authority. However, they based their foreign policy program on emphasis of the importance of Kyiv in the common history of the lands of ancient Rus′, quoting the Muscovite ruler Ivan IV as saying that "The land of Vilna and Podlasia, and the land of Halych, and the land of Volhynia, all were those of Kyiv."[18] Ideologically, then, the entire Grand Duchy of Lithuania was included into the sphere of dependence on Moscow via tools of propaganda through Kyiv. Kyiv figured importantly in the Muscovite rulers' efforts to base their claim to the tsarship. It was here that they used their ties with their distant forefather, Duke Vladimir (Volodymyr) Monomakh of Kyiv, who by their account had received the tsarist regalia from the Byzantine Empire. To show Moscow's spiritual affinity with Kyiv, they invoked two sayings— "Moscow is the second Kyiv" and "Moscow is the third Rome"—that in their minds established continuity. Lithuanian diplomats fought Moscow's claims to the tsarship by descent from the Kyivan dukes, averring in 1548 that "No one is fit to be crowned with the title of the Tsar of Kyiv save his Royal Highness [the King of Poland], and not the Grand Duke of Moscow."[19]

If so, this was the complex spiritual ecosystem that the Ruthenian Orthodox believers in the Grand Duchy of Lithuania and the Muscovite state inhabited at the beginning of the early modern period. These two Eastern Slavic Orthodox communities grew from one trunk, the center of ancient Rus′ in Kyiv; now, at the beginning of the early modern period, they lived in different countries that were enemies and far from one another. Changes that occurred in the internal affairs of the Orthodox world in the Commonwealth of the Two Nations demonstrate what this implied. At the end of the sixteenth century, the possibility of creating a union between Orthodox believers and Catholics was discussed. By then, several events had changed the balance of power between Catholicism and the Orthodox confession in the Grand Duchy. One of them was the 1569 Union of

---

18   Cited on the basis of Rusina, "Kyiv iak sankta civitas," 189.
19   Ibid., 190.

Lublin, following which Lithuania lost half of its Orthodox lands together with the most important religious centers of Orthodoxy that had been its, foremost Kyiv. Another important reason for the joint Polish-Lithuanian state to form an ecclesiastical union was the establishment of the Muscovite patriarchate in 1589, which the Commonwealth of the Two Nations understood as portending the menace of the Kyiv metropolis's becoming subordinate to the ecclesiastical structure controlled by the Muscovite state. The idea of an ecclesiastical union was strongly supported, and was initiated in several ways, both by rulers of the Commonwealth of the Two Nations and by the Catholic Church hierarchy. Each side viewed the future union first and foremost as a political act and an attempt to erect a barrier against the union that the Orthodox Church and the state in the Grand Duchy of Moscow had formed—one that was gathering strength and threatened to expand.[20]

Although ways to modernize the Orthodox Church belonged to this plethora of aims, differences of view quickly arose. The Catholic hierarchy saw the union as the incorporation of the Orthodox Church into the Catholic Church; Orthodox believers envisaged their church as an equal partner. When the issue was taken up at the Brest Synod in 1596, the discussants split into two synods—Uniates and anti-union forces, later called Disuniates. By the end of the sixteenth century, the Orthodox Church of the Commonwealth had fractured into two—the Greek Catholic Church and the Orthodox Church. All Orthodox boyars who attended the synod, most from the eastern lands of the Kingdom of Poland, opposed the ecclesiastical union. Fewer Orthodox boyars from the Grand Duchy of Lithuania actively resisted the union because, until the creation of the union, a very large proportion of the Lithuanian boyars as well as magnates who had once been Orthodox had converted to Catholicism or Protestantism (predominantly the Evangelical Reformed

---

20 For more information on theological differences between these churches, see Oskar Halecki, *From Florence to Brest (1439–1596)* (New York: Fordham University Press, 1958); Borys Gudziak, *Crisis and Reform. Kievan Metropolitanate, the Patriarchate of Constantinopole and the Genesis of Union of Brest* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1999); Sergii Plokhy, *The Origins of the Slavic nations*, 181–186; Jerzy Kloczowski, *A History of Polish Christianity* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008), 50–83 (chapter "The expansion of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries"), 84–125 ("Great reforms"); Antoni Mironowicz, "Ortodox Church in the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth in the 16th–18th Century," *Białostockie Teki Historyczne* 14 (2016): 41–61; Baronas and Rowell, *The Conversion of Lithuania*, 379–402 (chapters "Bulwark of Latin and Greek Christendom?," "Union and disunity," "Relation between Catholic, Orthodoxs and Unionist Cristians," "Micro-historical contacts").

Church). The pro-Catholic position of the Polish King and Lithuanian Grand Duke Sigismund III Vasa (r. 1588–1632) tipped the scales in favor of the Greek Catholic Church, making it the only legally recognized Ruthenian (Eastern Rite) confession in the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth after the Union of Brest in 1596. The Catholic Church and the union enjoyed stronger support among the ruling elite of the state, the Orthodox Church gradually lost its most important secular patrons after the descendants of Konstantyn Ostrogski, like those of several other influential Orthodox magnates, converted to Catholicism after Ostrogski's death. Just the same, the Uniates were unable to eliminate the old Orthodox Church by absorbing it.

The war between the Grand Duchy of Lithuania and Muscovy for hegemony in Eastern Europe exacerbated the schism between Muscovy's Orthodox believers and the Grand Duchy of Lithuania's Orthodox and Uniate adherents. The 1569 Union of Lublin created conditions for the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth to change this trend, and in the first half of the seventeenth century the latter forced Moscow to withdraw. Indeed, in its 1609–1618 war with Moscow, the Commonwealth occupied massive parts of the rival's territory occupied as well as the Rus′ capital, Moscow. One year into that conflict, the Commonwealth declared Władysław, the son of its ruler Sigismund III Vasa, the Grand Duke of Muscovy. With Moscow mired in ongoing internal turmoil, intervention on behalf of the Muscovite state within the Grand Duchy of Lithuania grew through the exertions of influential supporters: the numerous Zaporozhian Cossacks and boyars from Ukraine in the Commonwealth army along with some Uniate and Orthodox inhabitants of the Grand Duchy's eastern lands. The most prominent of the latter was the GDL Chancellor Leon Sapieha, an Orthodox convert to Catholicism.

Under the Truce of Deulino that brought the war to an end in 1618, the Commonwealth obtained large swathes of territory but had to leave Moscow, where in 1613 Mikhail Romanov had been chosen Tsar of Russia. The Commonwealth did not recognize his election, considering Władysław IV Vasa the lawful ruler for many decades. In 1617–1618, GDL Grand Hetman Jan Karol Chodkiewicz once again led attacks on Moscow in order to force the latter to recognize Władysław IV Vasa as Tsar. He failed. In the first half of the seventeenth century, however, the Grand Duchy again reached its maximum size in the East. The Treaty of Polyanovka, executed in 1634 after Moscow lost the so-called Smolensk War in 1632–1634, set in concrete a geopolitical balance that had been in place in Eastern Europe, allowing it to last until the middle of the seventeenth century.

What effects did the huge territorial losses, coupled with involvement in lengthy wars, have on the political culture of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania? Did they fracture the political nation or in fact bring it together? Seeking an answer to these questions, the Lithuanian historian Zenonas Norkus invokes Michael W. Doyle's concept of the "Augustan threshold" to help link changes at the level of state with those in a state's political culture. Once an empire reaches reached this threshold,[21] Norkus reasons, it has exhausted its possibilities of territorial expansion because its elite is busy trying as to solve the problem of how to rule and oversee the empire's cultural and political diversity. An empire that stumbles against the threshold ends up fracturing into small political units. One that successfully makes it past the threshold finds forms of political organization that construct a compromise among these varied interests within the ruling elite at the core of the state, and between the state and the most influential members of the elites in its outlying areas. These forms ensure a lengthy internal stability that can express itself in long-term internal cultural, social, and political forces that abet transnational integration.[22]

In Norkus's opinion, a good one-third of the territory that the Lithuanian state lost in the wars with Moscow in the late fifteenth century and in the sixteenth century did not fracture the process of state integration; in fact, they made integration easier. The eastern lands were the farthest away from the core of the Duchy and, thus, were the most difficult to integrate into the political organism of the GDL. The central government of the GDL had the weakest ties with the duchies of the Upper Oka River, which were ruled by the Rurik dynasty and essentially belonged solely to that dynasty's "informal empire" or sphere of sovereignty. Lithuanian lost these duchies before the death of Grand Duke Casimir (1492), at the beginning of the border war that had erupted with Moscow. Some of the Upper Oka duchies disavowed the new Lithuanian Grand Duke Alexander, went over to the rule of Muscovite Grand Duke Ivan III, and soon began to attack neighbors that still recognized the GDL's sovereignty. Such among these neighbors that did not receive military support from Lithuania, which had been promised to them by vassal treaties, had no choice but to follow suit.[23]

---

21 This study does not discuss the question, examined by Norkus, of whether the Grand Duchy of Lithuania was an empire or not. Instead, it treats the word "empire," as used by the author, as the equivalent of a state. See Zenonas Norkus's *Nepasiskelbusioji imperija*, 473. See also the review by J. Kiaupienė, "Naujas žvilgsnis į Lietuvos Didžiosios Kunigaikštystės istoriją," *Lietuvos istorijos metraštis* 1 (2009): 127–134.

22 Norkus, *Nepasiskelbusioji imperija*, 326–327.

23 Ibid., 328.

Expanding on Norkus's considerations, one may wonder about the effect of the GDL's surrender of its southern territories to the Kingdom of Poland in 1569 had on the GDL's political culture. The loss had cost Lithuania much of its territory, population, and income. However, it also absolved the Grand Duchy of having to deploy military forces to these border territories and see to their defense. The violence that the ruler and the Polish Sejm used not only made personal ties between Sigismund Augustus and the political leaders of the GDL more complicated but also left its mark on the behavior of the entire political nation of the Commonwealth of the Two Nations that had been created as a result. The evidence shows that the loss of Volhynia, Kyiv, and other southern territories of the state consolidated Lithuania's political nation and served this nation as a pillar of support, so to speak, in its struggle against Poland's wishes of incorporation that made themselves known later. After the death of Sigismund Augustus, the last ruler of the Jagiellonian dynasty, in 1572, contenders to the throne of the Commonwealth and those who became its rulers were reminded for many years that they had to restore these territories to the Lithuanian state after having annexed them unlawfully. Since Lithuania never expressed this demand as an ultimatum, Poland's non-acquiescence did not destroy the foundations of the union that it had formed with Lithuania in 1569. However, it left a deep mark in the memory of the GDL's political nation and strengthened the belief, which had sunk deep into the country's historical memory, about a Lithuanian sovereignty that brooked no violation of its territorial integrity.

The loss of these lands severely reduced the territory of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania in Central Eastern Europe. Not until the middle of the seventeenth century, however, did territorial loss touch the core lands of the state. It is important to focus attention on this factor in terms of the political culture. The "land of Lithuania"—*Lithuania propria* (Lithuania Proper) in the language of sixteenth-century sources—had been the geopolitical and geocultural core of the future Grand Duchy of Lithuania since the thirteenth century. It was constituted of ethnic Lithuania and the neighboring lands that had been adjoined to it earlier in the thirteenth century: those on the left side of the Nemunas River basin (Navahrudak, Volkovysk, Slonim, and Grodno) as well as Minsk and the lands near the Berezina River, the upper Dniepr and Sozh rivers, and territories formerly belonging to the duchies of Turov, Pinsk, and Kleck. By the end of the fourteenth century, these lands were integral to the core of the Lithuanian state and formed an administrative, legal, and economic whole. To this cluster, Samogitia was joined under the 1422 Treaty of Melno, which

followed Lithuania's victory over the Teutonic Order at the beginning of the fifteenth century. Thus the ruling Gediminid dynasty, its roots having spread onto the land of the true Lithuania and expanding its holdings in Rus', created a multilingual, multi-ethnic and multi-confessional pluralistic monarchy with its capital in Vilnius during the Middle Ages.

In the geocultural landscape of the Grand Duchy, center and periphery still stood out clearly. On the topographical map of political power, the capital, Vilnius, was seen as the strongest center of attention, the place where the grand dukes of Lithuania made their home. In the Middle Ages and the early modern period, the court of a ruler, duke, or king commanded special importance in the political space of Europe. The palaces and estates where court life happened created conditions for the demonstration of authority and power, making the ruler's court a tool of political communication.[24] In this sense, the situation changed in the Grand Duchy of Lithuania in the middle of fifteenth century. When Lithuanian Grand Duke Casimir became the King of Poland in 1447, the ruler no longer made Vilnius his regular seat. Study of the frequency of Lithuanian Grand Duke Casimir's visits to and stays in Lithuania, as shown in his itinerary, demonstrates that sometimes he spent a year or more away from Lithuania.[25] When he died in 1492, there was hope in the Lithuanian political nation that the situation could change and the ducal court would once more begin to function in the capital. By decree of Casimir, the thrones of Poland and Lithuania were divided between his two sons: John (I) Albert (Jan Olbracht) as King of Poland and Alexander as the Grand Duke of Lithuania. The latter reestablished his residence in the Vilnius court—which, however, operated there in full format for just a few years. After the death of King of Poland John (I) Albert in 1501, Alexander was chosen as King of Poland and moved his main place of residence to Kraków.[26] The last two scions of the Jagiellonian dynasty, Sigismund the Old (1506–1548) and Sigismund Augustus (1548–1572), holding the twin thrones of Poland (king) and Lithuania (grand duke), chose as the Wawel in Kraków as their primary place of residence. In previous years, foreign rulers visited the Grand Duchy of Lithuania to deal with issues related

---

24 R. G. Asch, "The Princely Court and Political Space in Early Modern Europe," in Beat A. Kümin, *Political Space in Pre-Industrial Europe* (Farnham: Ashgate, 2009), 43–60.

25 See Grażyna Rutkowska, *Itinerarium króla Kazimierza Jagiellończyka, 1440–1492* (Warsaw: Neriton, 2014).

26 See Krzysztof Pietkiewicz, *Itinerarium króla Aleksandra Jagiellończyka, 1492–1506* (Warsaw: Instytut Historii PAN, 2016).

to the state's internal and foreign affairs as well as for relaxation and hunting.[27] With the creation of the Commonwealth of the Two Nations in 1569, the Kingdom of Poland became the center of the life of the composite state, the ruler's home, and the seat of the Sejm.

Under these circumstances, the estates of high-ranking state officials in Vilnius and Lithuania gradually began to take the place of the ducal court of the Grand Duchy, which had effectively moved to Kraków. This occurred because, unlike the cases of monarchies that took the path of absolutism, the magnates of the GDL retained and even strengthened their autonomy and influence in internal political life, creating the climate for a particular political culture. The boyars of the GDL, lacking the changes that would allow them to gain experience in the public life of the state, statecraft skills, and career hopes, began to lean on the most powerful magnates and demanded entrée to their courts. This steadily strengthened the system of client relationships that bound the magnates and boyars together and created the conditions for an atmosphere in which a union between these classes could develop. It happened as the boyars in the Kingdom of Poland, whose opposition to the magnates was growing, were gaining the upper hand in the Kingdom, where what became known as the Executionist movement was in full swing.[28]

Norkus links the reform of the GDL state government and administrative apparatus in the second half of the fifteenth century to the transformation of the political regime into an estate monarchy and the accompanying crystallization of a structured society. High institutions of state governance that were absent in the ruler's court now began to evolve out of the GDL Council of Lords and Sejm. A gap began to emerge between the state as a corporate transpersonal subject or institution representing its "public interest," and the ruler and his dynasty as temporary servants of the state with private (dynastic) interests. Evidence of this gap is the systematic liquidation of partial and appanage duchies that had survived within the GDL array in the fifteenth century, as well as the decisive resistance of the Council of Lords in 1495 to the Polish Jagiellonians' offer to take care of Sigismund (the future Sigismund the Old, the future Grand Duke of Lithuania and King of Poland), youngest son of King Casimir, by creating a separate appanage Duchy of Kyiv for him. It was also shown by the dramatically changed view of public opinion toward

27 Antoni Gąsiorowski, "Itineraria dwu ostatnich Jagiellonów," *Studia Historyczne* 16, no. 2 (1973): 249–275.

28 For more about, this problem see Part I, Chapter 2 "A Sociopolitical and Sociocultural Portrait of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania" in this book.

attempts by representatives of the ruling dynasty to prop up their rule by lining up foreign countries' support. This is well illustrated by the case of Mikhailo Aleksandrovich Olelkovich, who, along with his accomplices, was sentenced to death in 1481 when his attempt to inherit the partial duchy of Kyiv from Casimir and join forces with Moscow to defend his "dynastic rights" failed.[29]

The GDL's domestic administrative system was based in the Vilnius and Trakai palatinates as well as the Duchy of Samogitia, which came into being in 1413. It was there that a large majority of the magnates and the Catholic boyars lived—people who worked closely with the ruling dynasty but did not depend on it. This has long been known in historiography. The problem, however, is that historians have been examining separate aspects of the geocultural landscape of the GDL for much time but have not linked them into a whole. Much has been written about the ethnic, linguistic, and cultural heterogeneity of the Lithuanian state. Lacking in this portrait of the GDL's heterogeneous society, however, are the characteristics that fuse its constituent parts. Absent, for example, is an answer to the question of how the pagan Lithuanians, an ethno-confessional and ethno-cultural minority in the Lithuania state's core lands, and the Samogitians established a dominating metropolis, brought the territorially somewhat larger periphery of Christian Orthodox Ruthenians under their control, seized the political levers of the state, and kept them under their dominion over time. To seek the answers, we need to plumb the depths of the country's political culture.

It was Norkus's insights, expressed in his above-referenced monograph, that gave historians of the GDL political culture an impetus to revisit known facts from a broader sociological perspective on empires and to seek new approaches. Norkus's sociological approach toward empires gave them the opportunity to reveal the "mechanisms" that regulated the internal life of an ethnically, religiously, and culturally complex society—something that historians dealing with the GDL often overlook or focus on one characteristic of the uniqueness of this society to the exclusion of others. It often occurs in examining ethnic heterogeneity when a scholar attempts to emphasize the multicultural character of GDL society and endow it with traits of a modern nation that are uncharacteristic of medieval and early modern societies.

What is important in terms of the political culture is Norkus' criticism of the notion, repeated for many years and commonly asserted in Lithuanian historiography—that the Ruthenian were willingly attached their lands to the

---

29 Norkus, *Nepasiskelbusioji imperija*, 325–326.

Lithuanian state. The theory that Lithuania expanded due to the good will of the duchies of Rus′ is a well-constructed popular myth that owes its origins to nineteenth-century historiography. Norkus emphasizes the fact that the Ruthenian lands were not sovereign during the times of the GDL′s territorial expansion; instead, they were subordinate to the Golden Horde. Thus, they could not have "willingly" joined the Lithuanian state. One rising empire (the Grand Duchy of Lithuania) took them from another that was in decline (the Golden Horde). Rus′ split into "Tatar Rus′," which was subordinate to the rule of the Rurikids and their starosta (the Tatar-appointed Grand Duke Vladimir) and "Lithuanian Rus′," ruled by Lithuanian dukes.[30]

These are only the most important geopolitical and geocultural processes that unfolded in Central Eastern Europe up to the middle of the seventeenth century—those that formed the sociopolitical and sociocultural society of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania, creator of the political nation that represented the GDL.

---

30   See ibid., sections 3.1–3.4.

2 A Sociopolitical and Sociocultural Portrait of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania

There is currently no sociopolitical and sociocultural portrait of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania in historiography. Historians merely understand and describe what may be called the primary "face" of this portrait in different ways—a society politically engaged in the life of the state, the kind of society that we call a "political nation" in this book. Given the short history of research on the political nation of the GDL, this should come as no surprise.

The first to research the development and structure of Lithuania's political nation was the Polish historian Jerzy Suchocki, who in 1983 formulated a theory about this nation in the late medieval Grand Duchy. In 1385–1569, Suchocki states, this society was comprised of the social upper crust (*wspólnota państwowa)*—dukes and magnates, former high-ranking state officials, and the priesthood as an intellectual elite—that ruled the Lithuanian state. Suchocki even drew up a nominal list of families that, he said, comprised the GDL's political nation and showed how its makeup changed when it was joined by the Orthodox Slav boyars from the Ruthenian lands.[1]

In the 1990s, the Lithuanian historians Rita Trimonienė, Edvardas Gudavičius, and Mečislovas Jučas began to discuss the formation of the GDL's political nation and laid down the first theories that trace their ownership to Lithuanian researchers.[2] Trimonienė and Gudavičius highlight the

---

1 J. Suchocki, "Formowanie się i skład narodu politycznego w Wielkim Księstwie Litewskim późnego średniowiecza," *Zapiski Historyczne* 48, no. 1–2 (1983): 31–78.

2 R. Trimonienė, "Lietuvos Didžiosios Kunigaikštystės vidaus konsolidacijos ir" politinės tautos "formavimosi problema," *Lietuvos istorijos studijos* 2 (1994): 17–34; R. Trimonienė, *Lietuvos Didžioji Kunigaikštystė ir Vidurio Europa XV–XVI a. sandūroje* (Šiauliai: Šiaulių pedagoginis institutas, 1996); R.Trimonienė and E. Gudavičius, "Bajoriškoji lietuvių tauta ir Lietuvos Didžioji Kunigaikštija," *Dienovidis*, February 5–11, 1999, no. 5 (407), 10; February 12–18, 1999, no. 6 (408), 13; February 19–25, 1999, no. 7 (409), 10; February 26–March 4, 1999, nr. 8 (410), 12; March 5–11, nr. 9 (411), 10; M. Jučas, *Lietuvos ir Lenkijos unija (XIV a. vid.—XIX a. pr.)* (Vilnius: Aidai, 2000), 183–214.

uniqueness of the political nation of the GDL. In their opinion it was only the feudal upper crust, the dukes and magnates, who were referred to as a political nation in Lithuania, a country on the periphery of Central Europe. The boyar class, they aver, became part of this political nation only in the second half of the sixteenth century. Only then, it follows, can one begin to speak of the creation of a boyar Lithuanian nation, which by then also included the aristocracy of the Ruthenian lands.[3] In his synthesis of Lithuanian history until 1569, Gudavičius again states with emphasis that a Lithuanian boyar nation became a historical reality in the middle of the sixteenth century; it is in this context that he introduces the concept of a Lithuanian *political* nation of boyars.[4]

Jučas chose a broader view for his research on the phenomenon of the political nation. His understanding ties not only into the process of the expansion of the boyars' political and civic rights but also into the development of boyar land tenure. Examining these issues and their interrelations in the context of the unions of Lithuania and Poland, Jučas argues that the political nation was formed from above by privileges from rulers. The political nation's genesis lasted two centuries, he states: from the end of the fourteenth century to the end of the sixteenth. The primary traits of this political nation, in Jučas's construct, are the unfettered right to use estates that they received either by inheritence or from the state; threefold (fiscal, administrative, and legal) immunity in their holdings; the privilege of taking up public office and administering for the duration of their life the estates that they received from the state; courts of law founded on the basis of the territorial principle for the entire landed class in that palatinate and legal authority based on *ius indigenatus*; a sejmik—the basic cell of all of parliamentary life; and military service for the entire boyar class with no distinction among groups. The political nation was comprised of only about nine percent of the country's population. It was not coterminous with the Lithuanian ethnos. It was held together not by ethnic principles but by civic and class tenets. Even Orthodox believers who were members of this political nation called themselves Lithuanians and citizens of the Lithuanian state.[5]

---

3 Trimonienė and Gudavičius, "Bajoriškoji lietuvių tauta," 10.

4 E. Gudavičius, *Lietuvos istorija nuo seniausių laikų iki 1569 metų* (Vilnius: Lietuvos rašytojų sąjungos leidykla, 1999), 595–598.

5 Jučas, *Lietuvos ir Lenkijos unija*, 205, 213–214.

An inspection of the historiography shows that, in their efforts to describe this sociopolitical phenomenon, historians long used several terms as synonyms for concepts that in reality were different: "political nation," "boyars," "boyar class," "boyar nation," "Lithuanian political nation of boyars," and so on. The variety of these descriptions confuses readers and raises questions about the identicality of their content and the propriety of using them as synonyms. The Lithuanian historian of philosophy Romanas Plečkaitis shows us a path that we may follow to find our way out of this labyrinth. His explanation of the phenomenon of the Lithuanian political nation is tied to Renaissance culture. European humanistic ideas, Plečkaitis emphasizes, encouraged a search for an innovative basis for individuals' socialization, national roots, and the actualization of efforts to form nation-states. Renaissance people who desired fame hoped to find it while working for their nation and their state. The Lithuanian intellectual elite believed, or wanted to believe, that the information laid out in legends about theor origins of was true and that Lithuanian society should know about its illustrious past, glorify it, and perpetuate its traditions in the GDL.[6]

Lithuanian written language of Lithuanian began to form late (the first Lithuanian book of religious content was printed in 1547). Early sources were written in Latin, Ruthenian, and Polish. Therefore, in sixteenth-century Lithuanian written sources, the terms *gens, genus, natio,* and *narod* are used to describe the term *nation,* for which the Lithuanian word is *giminė.*

The concept of nation at the time was seen as something of political nature. The political aspect of this meaning is the nation of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania (in Polish, *naród Wielkiego Księstwa Litewskiego*; in Ruthenian, *norod Velikogo Kniazstva Litovskogo*), a concept that embraces the citizens of the state, which constitute the nation as a political unit, that is, a political nation. The concept of political nation encompassed the public life of citizens of the GDL. The noble class was considered tantamount to the nation. Only the nobles, even though they were a minority of the state's actual population, were considered citizens and had all the rights in the state. All Lithuanian and Ruthenian boyars who lived within the territory of the state, regardless of language, religious beliefs, customs, and other differences, comprised the political as well as the public unit that was held to be the nation of the GDL. This political nation

---

6   The links between legends about the origins of Lithuanians and the political nation and its culture are discussed in greater detail in the chapter titled "The Mythological Space of the Political Culture of the GDL."

possessed a common historical territory, or homeland, and common rights and duties grounded in law.

Given the expansion of the state into Slavic lands, the historical memory of the nation could only be partly shared. The political nation was held together by an economic alliance that contrasted with territorial mobility. Although differentiated in language and religion, boyars at large called themselves Lithuanians. During the period under discussion, language, religious beliefs, and culture were not considered national traits. What is more, the notion of the political nation did not include all inhabitants but just those among them who had the privileged right to take part in the life of the state. This concept of a political nation as a public or state unit developed in medieval Europe under the influence of Christian thought. In the Late Middle Ages, the exhortations of various political thinkers to integrate majority rule ("according to numbers") into the concept of the "nation" remained an idea ahead of its time. It is here, however, that Plečkaitis notices another developmental trend in Lithuania of the Renaissance era, when political unity began to be based on national unity. In sixteenth-century Lithuania, he emphasizes, the idea of nation-based state-hood was fostered by the Chancellor of the GDL, Albert Gasztold (Albertas Goštautas), a senior official, who distinguished between the concepts of nation and state, as well as of nationality and citizenship, in his writings. Thus Plečkaitis also infers that the intellectual class of Lithuania responded to the Renaissance concept of the nation-state by aiming to unite the civic identity of GDL citizens as well as the ethno-cultural identity that existed alongside it.[7]

This insight is very important for understanding the GDL's political nation and its culture. The separate ethno-cultural identities of Lithuanians and Ruthenians developed within this political nation at the same time, and strengthened it. What also existed during that period was a state civic identity that brought the political nation together. This is a fundamental characteristic of the GDL's political nation; without appreciating it, one cannot understand the sociocultural portrait of the sociopolitical society that developed under these unique historical circumstances.

The GDL's political nation began to emerge at a meeting point of civilizations during the Late Middle Ages, its makeup and size undergoing great change. Never, however, did it embrace the entirety of the boyar class and cannot be understood as analagous to this class. Belonging to this class merely

---

7 R. Plečkaitis, *Lietuvos filosofijos istorija*, vol. I: *Viduramžiai—Renesansas—Naujieji amžiai* (Vilnius: Kultūros, filosofijos ir meno institutas, 2004), 78–79.

opened a path to membership in the political nation. True membership was individual and was determined by the individual's decision to play an active role in the public of the state and take responsibility for its fate. At various times, priests of various confessions, as participants in public life, also enlisted in the creation and development of the political nation. The figures of the cultural elite, even if not of boyar extraction, were also attributed to the political nation due to the nature of their public work and their influence on the political culture of the sociopolity and the socioculture.

The individual membership of burghers in the political nation is still an open question that entails further research. During the time under discussion (until the middle of the seventeenth century), burghers were not full-fledged participants in the political and parliamentary life of the Kingdom of Poland and Grand Duchy of Lithuania. It is true that by the first half of the sixteenth century representatives of some large cities, first and foremost Kraków, capital of the Kingdom of Poland, had the right to take part in sejmiks together with envoys of the *szlachta*. Burghers' participation in politics, however, remained restricted. The only way they could acquire all political rights of the *szlachta* was becoming members of the nobility. In regard to the Lithuanian capital, Vilnius, it is known that a 1563 instruction from the Sejm of the Grand Duchy foresaw the participation of representatives of that city along with envoys of the boyars in a joint Poland/GDL Sejm in Warsaw, which was to discuss the question of renewing the union. In 1568, the ruler extended the privilege of nobility to members of the Vilnius municipal council in the GDL Sejm as a gift for the unceasing loyal service and continual financial support that the burghers of Vilnius had provided during the recent war with Muscovy. Thus it was by an exception that Vilnius municipal councilors were allowed to take part in sejmiks. Indeed, two Vilnius burgomasters and a scribe participated in the 1569 Lublin Sejm and signed the Act of the Union of Lublin. Representatives of the Vilnius municipality also acted as observers at Sejms of the Commonwealth of the Two Nations, with an advisory vote.[8] This exceptional situation of these few Vilnius city representatives and the opportunity they had to take part in Sejms, however, does not answer the question of burghers' membership in the

---

8 For more, see Tadeusz Wasilewski, "Nobilitacje miast w dawnej Rzeczypospolitej Obojga Narodów," *Czas, przestrzeń, praca w dawnych miastach* (Warsaw: Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN, 1991), 373–385; Andrzej Rachuba, *Wielkie Księstwo Litewskie w systemie parlamentarnym Rzeczypospolitej w latach 1569–1763* (Warsaw: Wydawnictwo Sejmowe, 2002), 170–173.

Lithuanian political nation; in the best case, it allows us to contemplate individuals' prospects of becoming members of a political nation.

The makeup of the political nation's membership changed and variegated as the magnates and nobles of the former lands of Rus' merged into the fabric of the Lithuanian state. This is why, instead of the descriptive term "Lithuanian political nation" that Lithuanian historiography favors, I speak of "the Grand Duchy of Lithuania's political nation." It allows us analyze the matter issue from the perspective of a sociopolitical community that was ethnically, religiously and cultural diverse, and not only homogenously ethnic Lithuanian. It avoids traces of our modern understanding of the nation-state, which does not fit the historical concept as it existed in the early modern period. And it sheds more light on the specific ties that brought together and fused this structurally complex society, which participated in ruling the Lithuanian state, and to understand its nature.

The most important criteria for recognizing a person's or group's membership in a political nation may be the following: work in the state's public legislative, administrative, and judicial apparatus or in its diplomatic service (given that a society's life depends on these officials' behavior and decisions); systematic participation in public political life at the district level, foremost in the Sejms and the sejmiks, as well as in the creation of the state's justice system; and multifaceted creative activities, the written and oral products of which form a sociopolitical society's value system as well as its statehood and civic identity.

The roots of the GDL's political nation trace to the late fourteenth century and the first half of the fifteenth century and are composed of the country's dukes and magnates. In this initial period of the development of the political nation, the motive power was provided by Lithuanian dukes. In the Middle Ages, Lithuanian rulers and the ruling dynasty selected representatives of the Lithuanian magnate class, an outgrowth of the era of the gentry, and co-opted them into the discussion of state issues, participation in negotiations, the adoption of international treaties that were concluded, and work in creating the administrative apparatus of the state. These were the pioneers of the GDL's political nation.

In the historical memory of the nation, the maturation of the idea of the Lithuanian state and the laurels that were owed to its carriers belonged to the dukes. With the growth of the state's territory, however, and the development of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania, the ducal stratum expanded and changed, acquiring traits that made it stand out against the Central and Eastern European

backdrop. One of these special characteristics was diversity. The Polish historian Józef Wolff, who researched the genealogy of numerous ducal families from the end of the fourteenth century onward,[9] distinguished among three main origin groups of which this class and its subgroups were composed:

1. Dukes of Lithuanian origin, including those who ruled until the end of the thirteenth century as well as the descendants of Gediminas (the Gedinimids).
2. The Rurik dukes, who came from Rus' lands that became part of the GDL.
3. Dukes from Muscovy and of Tatar origin.[10]

More recent historiographical research on the GDL dukes has reexamined Wolff's conclusions, revised his genealogical maps, and supplemented his research with new data.[11] A wealth of earlier works on the subject of the dukes of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania and the changes that they underwent has been discovered and is constantly being augmented. Historians focus the greatest attention on the genealogy and heraldry of specific dukes and ducal families; those of the Gediminid dynasty have garnered the most research.[12] Works that examine these individuals and groups of as a social and political construct and reveal their contributions to the life and society of the Lithuanian state, however, are few and far between.

The Middle Ages and the early modern period created entirely different societies. Thus, the ambitions of one period should not be attributed to generations that inhabited other centuries.[13] Consequently, one cannot study the Lithuanian dukes of the early modern period and their contribution to the political culture on the basis of medieval sources only. Neither can one

---

9 Józef Wolff, *Kniaziowie Litewsko-Ruscy od końca czternastego wieku* (Warsaw: Gebethner i Wolff, 1895).

10 Ibid., XXI.

11 For more on the historiography of the matter, see L. Korczak, *Monarcha i poddani. System władzy w Wielkim Księstwie Litewskim w okresie wczesnojagiellońskim* (Kraków: Towarzystwo Wydawnicze "Historia Iagellonica," 2008), 58–60.

12 For more historiographical discussion of this topic, see V. Jankauskas, *Lietuvos Didžiosios Kunigaikštystės valdančiosios dinastijos struktūra XIII a. pabaigoje—XV a. viduryje*, PhD dissertation, Vytautas Magnus University, Kaunas (Kaunas: Vytauto Didžiojo universiteto leidykla, 2011), 10–19.

13 As stressed by S. C. Rowell, "Amžinos pretenzijos arba kaip turime skaityti elitinę literatūrą?," in *Seminarai*, ed. Alvydas Jokubaitis and Antanas Kulakauskas (Vilnius: Vyturys, 1998), 8.

fit the ducal stratum into the processes that formed the GDL's magnate class, the boyar class, and the political nation by fusing these two distinct periods in Lithuanian history.

From the territorial standpoint, the roots of medieval Lithuania's political culture lie in the soil of Lithuania in the narrow sense of the term: the Lithuanian-inhabited lands that constitute the core of the state. In the first half of the thirteenth century, in the territories between the Nemunas and Neris rivers, an institution of older dukes took shape on the principle of familial ties. These dukes, hailing from Lithuania in the narrow sense, laid the political foundations of the shape of the Lithuanian state.[14] To study the Lithuanian political culture, it is also important to pay attention to the interaction that took place between the ducal class and the magnates who represented the societies of these lands—without whose participation the dukes would not have been able to carry out the creation of a Lithuanian state and implement a program with which to strengthen it.

The biggest contribution to research on this issue is that of the Lithuanian historian Rimvydas Petrauskas. His studies on Lithuania in the late fourteenth and fifteenth centuries yield critical assessments of a widely held theory in historiography about the initial government of the Grand Dukes, in which the country's entire public administrative structure ostensibly originates. In Petrauskas' opinion, this kind of viewpoint is too simplistic to address the complex question of the functioning of government in medieval Lithuania. Instead of a strict chronological border that assigns initial government to the rulers and "second" government to the boyars, Petrauskas discusses the different degrees of governance that these governments provided and documents their coexistence. The dukes, unable to rely on state structures that had not yet been formed, had to look for help to carry out their political program and solve the problems of rule. The only real force that could provide this assistance was the boyars. It is precisely this category of magnate groups, fronted by a duke of Gediminid origin, that allows us to interpret many of the most important political events of the fifteenth century with somewhat more accuracy than research has shown thus far.[15] This is possible to say. Both classes, the dukes and the boyars, had an interest in establishing and strengthening relations—a natural phenomenon

---

14 To become acquainted with this stratum of dukes, its internal structure, and its status in society during the time of the founding of the Lithuanian state, consult Gudavičius, *Mindaugas*; *Lietuvos istorija*, vol. 3, part 2, chapter 4, 300–334.

15 R. Petrauskas, *Lietuvos diduomenė XIV a. pabaigoje—XV a. Sudėtis—struktūra—valdžia* (Vilnius: Aidai, 2003), 210–212.

in a society where rule was predicated on personal ties. Amid constant struggles for the throne, any candidate's chances depended on the sympathies of the magnates, who had to be won over and preserved. Competition in the Gediminid dynasty left ample room for the magnates to express their will. It also, along with family ties, determined the makeup of the groups of magnates.

During the Middle Ages, magnate rule coexisted with the government of the Grand Duke—that of the ruling dynasty—so intimately that in the early Lithuanian state one cannot separate the two. The Grand Duke's rule and the success of his endeavors depended heavily on his ability to maneuver among the various factions of magnates and use them for state reforms or military exploits. In early Lithuanian history, one encounters not the gradual growth of ducal rule but specific periods in which individual rulers (such as Mindaugas and Gediminas) were able to consolidate the magnates, gather up the most important levers of power, and initiate change in the system of rule. The factor that probably contributed the most to the formation of a solid elite of magnates was that there was no real danger of the break-up of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania during the Middle Ages, notwithstanding quarrels among members of the ruling dynasty. The support of the most influential segment of the magnate class entrenched the new monarch's rule in Lithuania and helped to regulate the dynastic succession. Notably, too, each side, the duke and the magnates depended on the other. The Lithuanian historian even theorizes about the integral nature of this relationship, possibly sustaining the argument that the boyars could not have appeared as there were no dukes.[16]

Summarizing this aspect of Lithuania's early political system, it is important to stress two social factors of lasting importance that came into play at this foundational time: the advent of the institution of a monarchy tied to the state and the formation of allodial magnate rule. Both processes abetted the nascence of a political nation, allowed the Lithuanian state to sustain itself, and greatly impacted the country's further integration in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries.[17]

How large was the ducal strata at this time? Who were these families that shared the governance of the country with the de jure rulers? According to the Polish historian Lidia Korczak, they were new generations of ducal families that Jogaila and Vytautas had ushered into public service of the state. In the

---

16   E. Saviščevas, "XV a. pirmosios pusės žemaičių aristokratijos socialinė transformacija," in *Konstantinas Jablonskis ir istorija*, ed. E. Rimša (Vilnius: Vilniaus universiteto leidykla, 2005), 172.

17   *Lietuvos istorija*, vol. 3, 358–361.

fifteenth century, there were some eighty families of this kind, which varied widely as a function of their wealth. At the turn of the sixteenth century, the population of ducal families dropped to around sixty because the GDL had lost its eastern territories in its wars with Muscovy. This affected the ducal class in terms of political and social status and in their forms of participation in the state administrative and ruling apparatus.[18] Korczak provides forty-five short biographies of dukes who were active participants in the state's political processes, supported the Grand Dukes' rule, and held various posts during the early Jagiellonian monarchy, which Korczak defines conditionally as ending in 1492. This group of dukes participated in the creation of the political culture of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania in the Late Middle Ages.[19]

These observations about the interaction between the dukes and magnates in medieval Lithuania allow us to understand how the political nation and the foundation of its culture began to evolve during the incipiency of the Lithuanian monarchy. Namely, it traces to the development of cooperation between the dynastic dukes and the magnate class in the ethnical Lithuanian territories. Another aspect is that it was then, during the Middle Ages, that the dukes in the Rus' lands, which the Lithuanian state had begun to annex, began to form relations with the ruling dynasty and the magnates of the "Lithuania in the narrow sense." This is a broad field of inquiry, which awaits deeper cultivation through additional research and interpretation.

Let us start with Lithuania's ethnically related neighbor, Samogitia, where the dukes were Lithuanian King Mindaugas's most important rivals in the struggle for power in the thirteenth century. However, there were no great differences between a duke and a magnate in thirteenth-century Samogitia. Indeed, the ducal rule may not yet have been hereditary at the time. If so, Samogitia did not have a ducal dynasty; real power rested in the hands of the public, which assembled from time to time to choose a duke as its military leader. In the second half of the thirteenth century, Samogitia's ducal class abruptly disappeared and all power began to pass over to the magnates. By the fourteenth century, the dukes in Samogitia were but a historical memory.[20]

In his research on the society of medieval Samogitia, Saviščevas claims that the coalition of Samogitian communities that resisted Mindaugas in the middle of the thirteenth century spared Lithuania from having an independent landed

---

18   Korczak, *Monarcha i poddani*, 61–102.

19   Ibid., supplement 2: *Kniaziowie w służbie monarszej*, 177–183.

20   A. Butrimas, V. Žulkus, A. Nikžentaitis, V. Vaivada, and E. Aleksandravičius, *Žemaitijos istorija* (Vilnius: Regnum Fondas, 1997), 53–101.

aristocracy. Samogitia's landed aristocracy, although by nature very prone to change in makeup and limited in powers, remained a force that consolidated and controlled all of life in the region until the early fifteenth century, reflecting its tribal sovereignty. Additionally, however, alongside manifestations of this tribe's regional dominance, Lithuanian influence there had also been evident since the second half of the thirteenth century. Yet, Lithuania's rulers were not able quickly and easily to break the power of the local aristocracy or supplant Samogitian sovereignty by moving boyars from Lithuania to Samogitia, arranging dynastic marriages, or taking measures that would "boyarize" the Samogitian aristocracy. Only in the first half of the fifteenth century did the Samogitian aristocracy and its ducal stratum integrate into the Lithuanian boyar class on a large scale.[21]

Saviščevas's concept implies that elements of a separate Samogitian magnate political culture existed in the Middle Ages. Saviščevas himself, however, does not elaborate on the problem of how this culture may have been expressed. Instead, he infers that the representatives of Samogitia's ruling elite slowly cut themselves off from the traditional culture of the region and adopted a "Lithuanian" model of greater boyar participation in the life and rule of the state. This process coincided with the integration of regional elites into the Grand Duchy's incipient boyar nation. As the pagan Samogitian nobles accepted the Catholic baptism[22] in 1413, the Lithuanian rulers Jogaila

---

21 E. Saviščevas, *Žemaitijos savivalda ir valdžios elitas 1409–1566 m.* (Vilnius: Vilniaus universiteto leidykla, 2010), 69–71; 81–82.

22 For more information, see D. Baronas and S. C. Rowell, *The Conversion of Lithuania*, 327–378 (chapter 8 "How to be Big in Europe: Covert the Pagans, Reduce the Schismatisc"). In the beginning, the authors draw the readers' attention to what was important to them in writing this chapter: "This chapter is devoted to the discussion of the conversion of Žemaitija (Samogitia), which gained momentum in the years after the Battle of Tannenberg (1410) and was finalised by establishing the diocese of Medininkai (Varniai) in 1417, virtually the only bishopric to be established by the Church Council (*sede vacante*). This topic has been covered a number of times mostly by Polish and Lithuanian sholars, but very little of it is available in Western European languages—a fact that goes a long way to explain why the conversion of Žemaitija is still *terra incognita* in much of modern Western European historiography. There are some remarks that need to be made at the outset. In contrast to earlier studies, we are going to present the conversion of Žemaitija in a broader context of the developments taking place within a period of time when the Council of Constance was convened. That is why we suppose that it is necessary to pay much more attention to the issue of unity between the Latin and Greek Churches when we talk about the conversion of Žemaitija. To say this is obviously not a revelation, but it is our contention that the issue of Church Unity was much more important for King Jogaila and Grand Duke Vytautas than the conversion of mere Žemaitija. The coversion of Žemaitija tended to be viewed by the

and Vytautas tethered the Samogitian elite to themselves by granting it privileges *en classe*. Nine years later came international recognition of the ruler of Lithuania as the sovereign of Samogitia. As the Samogitian boyars increasingly found their place in the structures of the Lithuanian boyar class, the concern of the Lithuanian administrative apparatus for their privileges was determined not so much by their regional landed-gentry identity as by their aim to reserve guaranteed posts in the local administrative system for their descendants. By protecting their stratum's privileges, the most prominent boyars of Samogitia also defended the special right to rule that these privileges set forth. Still, in the 1442–1566 period, the regional self-governance of Samogitia gradually weakened.[23] Here are some sentences explaining the situation of Samogitia in the Grand Duchy of Lithuania and the nature of Samogitian privileges:

> When in the fifteenth century Samogitia was finally integrated into the Grand Duchy of Lithuania, cultural, economic and social differences began to weaken but did not disapper completely. From the legal point of view, the status of Samogitia within the GDL did not differ much from that of the Ruthenian principalities. In the fourteenth century, the relations between the ruler and the regions not directly subordinate to him were gradually acquiring the shape of custum which in those times used to be presented as unchanging *starina*, i.e., antiquity. In the sixteenth century, the Samogitians also used this term when referring to their custom rights. However, the transfer of the term did not mean the transfer of the Rhutenian *starina*. On the other hand—and that is most important—research has shown that although *starina* declared the immutability of customs, in fact they were undergoing changes. It actually means that in the times of verbal custom law the realization of a custom depended on how it was explained by the side with the advantage of power. Abuse of the interpretations of legal norms was more complicated when laws were written down. This is probably the best indication of the different nature of the custom *starina* and privileges. For this reason, the phenomenon of regional privileges should not be unequivocally related to custom law. In other words, although custom law supplied many provisions that were included the privileges, the privileges did not develop directly from the tradition of custom law. It is obvious that the

---

protagonists on the Polish-Lithuanian side as a stepping stone to something much bigger and much more important—the bringing of the so-called schismatics to the unity with the Roman Catholic Curch," 327–328).

23 E. Saviščevas, *Žemaitijos savivalda ir valdžios elitas 1409–1566 m.*, 223–224.

culture of privileges of the estate nature came to the Grand Duchy of Lithuania from Poland Kingdom along with the Christianisation of Lithuania in 1387. Therefore the phenomenon of regional privileges should not be seen as a creation of Ruthenian legal culture. First khown regional privileges in the GDL date back to the beginning of the rule Casimir Jagiellon. One of them, or possibly the very first, was Casimir's privilege issued to the land of Samoginia Medininkai (1441). Most of Samogitian privileges were written in Latin. In this respect they differ marked from the privileges issued to other lands of the GDL, which were written in Ruthenian.[24]

The integration into the state's social and political structures of dukes from the annexed Rus' lands, along with that of magnates in territories under Lithuanian control, was a long and slow process that began in the Middle Ages and continued until the early modern period. The political, confessional, and cultural integration of the Orthodox dukes into the GDL public sphere in the early modern period, and their admission to the GDL political nation, were impeded along the way by several factors that were different in nature.

As the Lithuanian historian Darius Baronas points out, the expansion of Lithuanian ducal rule did not always keep up with the growth of the state's territory because the Grand Duchy was akin to a rather scattered mosaic collection of poorly integrated lands. Lithuania's expansion was in some ways a haphazard process that brought with it not only territorial victories but losses as well. The special trait of medieval Lithuania's political culture—its view of the state as a dynastic patrimony—was determined by the relatively weak integration of the Grand Duchy's separate parts. Disagreements among Gediminid descendants led to entanglements of political status among various lands within the state. This is why the primary tie between Lithuania and the Rus' lands was the institution of the Lithuanian Grand Duke and the military might of the Lithuanian boyars on which it could call.[25]

Discussing how the Rus' lands that the Grand Duchy had annexed during the Middle Ages were governed, the Lithuanian historian Artūras Dubonis shows evidence that almost all of the Gediminids had landholdings of their own there. Rus' was ruled in three different ways. Most of its lands became Gediminid duchies in a long process that started before the annexation and gradually evolved into hereditary patrimonies, which is why some Gediminids

---

24 For more information, see *Žemaitijos žemės privilegijos XV-XVIII a.*, ed. Darius Antanavičius and Eugenijus Saviščevas (Vilnius: Versus Aureus, 2010), 99–102.

25 *Lietuvos istorija*, vol. 3, 465–466, 477.

could became vassals of other rulers such as the King of Poland, the King of Hungary, or the Muscovite Grand Duke, from the second half of the fourteenth century onward. The dynasties of local dukes survived in some of these lands, while other districts were ruled by vice-regents of the Grand Duke.[26]

The Ukrainian historian Natalia Iakovenko shows how the rule of the Gediminid dukes developed in Volhynia and the Duchy of Kyiv after the internal struggles for the throne of the Grand Duchy ended upon Vytautas's death. Jogaila's middle son, Casimir, was declared the Grand Duke of Lithuania in 1440. In an attempt to stanch the intradynastic skirmishing, much of Volhynia was given to Duke Švitrigaila, Jogaila's youngest brother, for him to rule, while the Duchy of Kyiv was restored to Vladimir's son Alexander, cousin of the Lithuanian ruler Casimir Jagiellon. This stabilized the situation in the southern reaches of the GDL, the result being that the magnates in these lands seemed to withdraw willingly from active participation in the life of the entire state. Indeed, until the end of the fifteenth century, none of them took up any sort of public office and none aspired to a career in the capital, Vilnius. This happened, in Iakovenko's opinion, becuase the local elite was satisfied with the autonomous status of their regained territories, the growing insularity of social life in the lands of Volhynia and Kyiv, and the use by the aristocracy of the descendents of the Rurikid dukes who had ruled them, as well as the ruling Gediminids—making the dukes in these lands feel like rulers of micro-states within a state. Even after the autonomous status of Volhynia and Kyiv weakened in the sixteenth century, the dukes retained their exceptional position in the eyes of society, which Iakovenko describes as the "duke syndrome." The gap between them and the core of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania was widened further by the confessional barrier between Orthodox believers and Catholics.[27]

The integration of the Rus′ Orthodox dukes and magnates into Lithuania's political community was severely complicated by the decision of Lithuanian Grand Duke Jogaila and his political council to choose the Catholic rite of baptism. Apart from allowing Jogaila to become the King of Poland, this move determined the tethering of the Lithuanian state and its development to Catholic Europe. The policy change by this branch of Lithuania's ruling Gediminid dynasty reverberated throughout the political community of the Grand Duchy and did so perhaps most strongly among the Orthodox elite that ruled Rus′ lands. Catholic baptism changed relations with the Orthodox Church

---

26 Ibid., 57.
27 Natal′ia Iakovenko, *Ocherk istorii Ukrainy v srednie veka i rannee novoe vremia*, transl. V. Ryzhkovskii (Moscow: Novoe Literaturnoe Obozrenie, 2012): 190–2015.

that had been static since time immemorial. While the Orthodox Church was not carrying out extensive missionary work in Lithuania, some Lithuanian dukes and magnates did accept the Orthodox faith—Gediminid dukes who were to receive Ruthenian lands to govern and magnates who received allocations of those lands as vice-regents.[28] In the years after Catholic baptism became normative in the core territory of the dynasty and the state, restrictions on the rights of the Orthodox Church and its believers began to appear. Interfaith marriages were proscribed and various ordinances, especially in the "Lithuania in the narrow sense," limited the construction of new Orthodox churches. Jogaila's 1387 charter was declared valid for Catholic boyars only. The 1413 Union of Horodło banned Orthodox believers from public office and from receiving the Polish coats-of-arms that Catholic Lithuanian boyars were awarded.[29] However, not all of these bans were honored consistently; intermarriage even played an important role in the Orthodox magnates' integration into the magnate class of Lithuania. Although many members of the GDL's ruling elite were Catholic, everyday life brought them into constant contact with the complex and multifaceted confessional situation in the country. Lithuanian magnates who were named vice-regents and palatines in Ruthenian areas had to coexist with local Orthodox counterparts. Some magnates of the Ruthenian nidus used contacts with Lithuanian peers to join their families by adoption and receive the coats-of-arms that the Horodło union had denied them. This situation and, above all, the desire to secure the Ruthenians' support prompted Lithuanian rulers to revisit their decisions about the status of Orthodox believers and drop the political restrictions. In 1434, Grand Duke Sigismund put Catholic and Orthodox boyars on the same legal footing in most contexts and opened the door to Orthodox believers to build political careers in all but the highest public offices. Thus the gradual integration of Orthodox Ruthenian magnates into the political elite of Lithuania, which began in the fifteenth century, accelerated.

---

28 About changes in Orthodox position in Lithuania after Catholic baptism see more *Lietuvos istorija*, vol. 4, 209–212.

29 For the most recent research on the 1413 Horodło coats-of-arms, see J. Wroniszewski, "Pieczęcie polskie przy dokumentach horodelskich w świetle polskiej średniowiecznej sfragistyki / Lenkiški antspaudai prie Horodlės dokumentų Lenkijos Viduramžių sfragistikos šviesoje," in *1413 m. Horodlės aktai (dokumentai ir tyrinėjimai)/ Akty Horodelskie z 1413 roku (dokumenty i studia)*, ed. Jūratė Kiaupienė and Lidia Korczak (Vilnius: Lietuvos istorijos institutas, 2013), 145–159; 160–172; E. Rimša, "Horodlės aktai ir Lietuvos kilmingųjų heraldika / Akta Horodelskie a heraldyka Litewskich bojarów," in Kiaupienė and Korczak, *1413 m. Horodlės aktai*, 173–210; 211–254.

As the Lithuanian historian Ingė Lukšaitė stresses, the internal makeup of the Orthodox Church was not stable at any point in the sixteenth century. The Church's Lithuanian branch lived in political tension throughout the first century of the modern period. Its angst was sustained by the different cultural atmospheres, inherited from times past or recently developed, that Orthodox believers in the grand duchies of Lithuania and Muscovy breathed. Among those so troubled were Lithuanian Orthodox dukes, who became precipitants of even more acute tensions. The most famous of these men was Michael Glinski, who, on the pretext of defending Orthodox believers' rights, started a rebellion against Polish King and Lithuanian Grand Duke Sigismund the Old and the Council of Lords in Ruthenian lands in 1508. However, the Lithuanian state became a refuge for Orthodox believers who emigrated from Muscovy due to their faith. By then, the Orthodox monasteries of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania—medieval cultural hearths of Byzantium—had centuries of tradition behind them.[30]

Thus, the formation of the GDL's political nation in the second half of the fifteenth century and in the sixteenth century took place in stages. At first, the political nation was comprised of magnates from the core Lithuanian lands ruled by the Gediminid dynasty. Later on, new members of the boyar class began to join this sociopolitical organism. Among them were more and more Orthodox believers from the annexed Rus' lands.

Alvydas Nikžentaitis traces the formation of the political nation of Lithuania in the late fourteenth century to three distinct elements: the magnates, the faith and the clergy, and the dynasty. The second element, he stresses, did not exist in Lithuania, there being neither a faith or a local clergy that could have pulled all of society together. At this time, then, the Grand Duchy lacked the kind of player that could have created a national identity and fostered the idea of a nation in society. It did, however, have the Gediminid dynasty, which evolved its identity as a dynasty in ethnic Lithuanian lands first of all.[31]

Artūras Dubonis sees the problem of the creation of the nation from a different angle. Modeling the creation of a pagan Lithuanian nation, he stresses that the advent of the nation was determined by the collecting of elements of an identity and the expansion of power structures that moved in that direction

---

30 See *Lietuvos istorija*, vol. 5, 324–333.

31 A. Nikžentaitis, "Lietuvos Didžiosios Kunigaikštystės politinės tautos specifika ir santykis su moderniąja tauta," in *Praeities pėdsakais: skiriama profesoriaus daktarto Zigmanto Kiaupos 65-mečiui*, ed. E. Aleksandravičius and E. Rimša (Vilnius: Lietuvos istorijos instituto leidykla, 2007), 141–143.

and supported it. This is why the existence, strengthening, and development of the monarchy are considered in Dubonis's eyes the main tools of the creation of the nation. Namely, the Lithuanian nation appeared first and foremost as a sociopolitical manifestation. The growing strength of the Lithuanian identity allowed the dynasty, its boyars, and their subjects to broaden the criteria for the identification of other nations and ethnoses as foreign—which, in turn, gave the Lithuanian nation even more specific contours. The greatest impact was made by relations with the Ruthenians who were ruled by the Grand Duke. Lithuanian rule had been installed in a rather painful manner in those lands: The Lithuanians demonstrated their superiority through the domestic policies of the Gediminid dynasty, by which dukes who had converted to Orthodoxy lost their right to contend for the throne of the Grand Duchy in the future.[32]

The still-embryonic political nation in the second half of the fifteenth century began to unite and band together all participants in the state's public life: ethnic Lithuanians, Samogitians, Ruthenians, Catholics, Orthodox, and later Protestants and Uniates. The resulting state structure forged a singular internal sociopolitical and sociocultural identity. Concurrently, however, the ties that had closely linked the ruling dynasty and the political nation began to slacken. Primarily, as change occurred in the political society's relationship with the Lithuanian Grand Duke, who also became the King of Poland, so did the political society itself change, becoming a political nation. By the beginning of the sixteenth century, the lords of the GDL already saw themselves as *tutores regni* and considered the state's interests (that is, those of the dynasty) their own.[33] That one already finds traits of sociopolitical and sociocultural structure in the GDL's political nation at the beginning of the early modern period demonstrates as much.

Favorable conditions for the development and strengthening of a political nation in the public life of the GDL were created by client relationships that began to quickly evolve and expand in society during the sixteenth century and that would impact on society during the period under discussion in this study, that of the Commonwealth of the Two Nations. European historiography emphasizes that patron-client relations were stronger in Poland and Lithuania than elsewhere in Europe. The client system influenced the very development of the state in these countries and even distorted the order laid down in by

---

32 *Lietuvos istorija*, vol. 3, 545–548.
33 See S. C. Rowell, "Išdavystė ar paprasti nesutarimai?"; idem, "Bears and Traitors."

acts of law. To supplement Gottfried Schramm's observation in this matter,[34] I point out that the effect of the patron-client relations that existed in Lithuania and Poland on the countries' respective political cultures was not equal. In Poland, a conflict between politically active boyars, who gathered into a group called the Executionists, and the magnates came to a head in the sixteenth century. In Lithuania, relations between the magnates and their clients, the boyars, were much closer and, most importantly, based not based on friction but on cooperation. This kind of development in boyar-magnate relations was greatly impacted by political circumstances. In Lithuania, the most alarming circumstance, which prompted the sides to huddle together, was the aim of Poland's political nation to turn the Lithuanian state into a province of Poland.[35] This is why, when one examines the phenomenon of the political nation, it is of utmost importance to acquaint oneself with political clientism. This brand of relations strengthened and fostered the boyars' patriotism toward the GDL as a state; it also ripened the sociopolitical idea. For the most ambitious of the boyars, the client system, irrespective of their patrons' subjective goals, opened the door to public political life and provided opportunities to receive education and use it to the fullest.[36]

The sociopolitical and sociocultural vibrancy of GDL society and the political nation's accommodation of fresh blood were strengthened by the vigorous outflow of boyars for grand tours and study at European universities that began in the sixteenth century. In the early modern period, foreign study was an important medium of communication that guaranteed ties with the outer world and enriched contacts within the political nation. Sons of magnates were sent out, foremost, to receive training ahead of work in their country's administrative institutions. Accompanied by boyars, they returned from their learning opportunities to take up positions in a magnate's or ruler's court, a court of law, or an institution of the arts. Most of the boyars, in turn, came home to get involved in public service and join the political nation.

---

34 G. Schramm, "Patronage im Staat, Patronage am Stelle des Staates. Einleitung zur Diskusion," in *Klientelsystem im Europa der Frühen Neuzeit*, ed. Antoni Mączak with Elisabeth Müller-Lukner (Munich: Oldenbourg, 1988), 153–158.

35 This is discussed in greater detail in the chapter "The Ideological Actualization of Statehood."

36 For more on the impact of client relations on the formation and shaping of the GDL's political nation, see J. Kiaupienė, "*Mes, Lietuva*," 136–164; eadem, "Rola klienteli w procese jednoczenia narodu politycznego Wielkiego Księstwa Litewskiego w XVI w.," in *Rzeczpospolita państwem wielu narodowości i wyznań. XVI–XVIII wiek*, ed. Tomasz Ciesielski and Anna Filipczak-Kocur (Warsaw: Wydawnictwo DiG, 2008), 167–178.

To avoid equating the entire class of boyars with the political nation, it is important to ask how large this nation was. Since the sources do not furnish actionable statistics, I can only elaborate on common trends in the size of the political nation, assess changes in its makeup on an individual basis, and clarify the reasons for these changes.

Historians have never linked the numerical growth of the GDL's political nation with the tension in public life and within society, and have never discussed the possibility of a tie between threats to the state and the process of the political nation's development. Taking a closer look at the situation that I have just described, I venture an intuitive hypothesis: the political nation became more active at critical moments for the state and society—those when threats arose.

In the period under examination, the greatest menaces to the territorial integrity of the Lithuanian state and its society were the country's wars with Muscovy. In evaluating the sociopolitical aspect of this situation, it is not important that the military conflict ebbed and flowed and that hostilities were often halted by armistices that did not guarantee long-term peace. GDL society, enduring lengthy conditions of almost constant war, acquired particular organizational and developmental traits. Those of the boyar class, liable to military conscription, spent much time not only in battle but also in military encampments. What is more, they to finance the state's fast-growing military expenditures, sustain economic losses, and forfeit estates and holdings in territories that enemy armies occupied. The boyars of the eastern Ruthenian lands were the first to feel the threat of war, doing so in the late fifteenth century, and were the first to experience material and moral losses on its account.

I cannot say, however, that war had only adverse consequences for the country's sociopolitical development. The boyar conscript army served as an important place of rendezvous and communication for members of the magnate and boyar class. This new public forum became a hotbed for the development and maturing of the GDL's political nation, a hub where unifying patriotic values were instilled and disseminated. Land-owning boyars did sense the negative economic and social changes brought about by war and noted the growing threat to the state and its territorial integrity. The combination of these realizations cultivated their civic and political identity, brought together and strengthened the political nation, and energized its development in the sixteenth century. The more boyars of average wealth appeared alongside

magnates in the political nation, the large and stronger this sociopolitical and sociocultural partnership became.

Another source of threats was the Grand Duchy's partner, the Kingdom of Poland, where the ruling elite had been trying to swallow up Lithuania since the creation of the dynastic union in 1386. In the first half of the sixteenth century, the Polish boyars' Executionist movement popularized the political goal of turning the Grand Duchy of Lithuania into the Kingdom's third province, to be called New Poland. The rulers of the Gediminid-Jagiellonian dynasty that ruled both states displayed steadily weakening resistance to these schemes. With the Lithuanian state's sovereignty and even existence in imminent danger, the political nation jelled and the boyars' patriotic identity stiffened. They strove to cement their rights as a political nation and to implement their twin duties: to rule the state together with the dynasty and to modernize its structure in both theory and practice. Evidence of this is their representatives' work in standardizing, recording in writing, and putting in place the legal foundations for society and the functioning of the state, as manifested in the Lithuanian Statutes of 1529, 1566, and 1588 and the court and administrative reforms of 1564–1566. Cooperation between representatives of the elite artists of the multicultural GDL and the politicians, and the enlistment of them all in the political nation, were important in defending Lithuanian state sovereignty, as texts on historical, social, and political thought from the period under discussion attest. The contribution of artists is also recognizable in debates in the Sejm, political letters, and other modes of expression in public forums.[37]

The 1569 Union of Lublin, which established the Commonwealth, added another strong dose of politicization to GDL public life, provoked new tensions, and forced the Grand Duchy to seek and find new ways and means of cohabitation with the Kingdom of Poland's political nation within the shared setting of the Commonwealth of the Two Nations. When ruler Sigismund Augustus violated the guarantees of Lithuania's territorial integrity in 1569 by separating several southern palatinates from it and joining them to Poland, the makeup and size of the GDL's political nation declined markedly. The first intergovernmental elections after the 1572 death of Sigismund Augustus, the last monarch of the Gediminid-Jagiellonian dynasty, became yet another serious test and political school for Lithuania's political nation.

---

37 For elaboration and examination of all of these, see below, "The State in the Political and Legal Culture of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania."

It was the 1569–1588 period in which the maturity and cohension of the sociopolitical body was forged. The change in conditions that had ensued when the 1569 unification brought Lithuania into a commonwealth with the Kingdom of Poland may be seen as evidence of a certain level of maturity. These changes, enshrined in law in the 1588 redaction of the Lithuanian Statute, created new terms for the existence of the GDL's political nation within the Commonwealth.

A significant source of the political nation's growth and the factor that brought it to political maturity was the establishment of the Grand Duchy's Sejm, an institution that represented the boyars, at the turn of the sixteenth century. The Sejm, along with the sejniks that the 1564–1566 administrative reforms brought into being, were venues of joint political action at the state level. They gradually lured growing numbers of ordinary boyars into active participation in these bodies' society amid the development of a manner of public expression that may be identified as a political culture.[38]

Yet another important trait of the sociopolitical and sociocultural portrait of the GDL's political nation raises more questions than historians have been able to answer until now. Why didn't Lithuania's political society associate itself with the state territory formed by the Gediminid-Jagiellonian dynasty that ruled in 1386–1569/1572, instead protecting and preserving the sovereignty of the GDL? After that juncture, historians entertain no doubts about the tie between the political nation and the state's territory. In the case of Lithuania's political nation, however, a problem surfaces in explaining the concept of "state territory." On the one hand, the Grand Duchy of Lithuania should be understood through the use of this concept, which denotes a physical and spiritual place for public and private life that the political nation calls a homeland[39] and with which it identifies. Indeed, members of the political nation presented themselves as "We, Lithuania." On the other hand, one must remember that when Lithuanian Grand Duke Jogaila became King of Poland in 1386, the future Jagiellonian dynasty began to take form within the frame of new territories that it ruled, which at its peak included the kingdoms of Poland, Bohemia, and Hungary, and the Grand Duchy of Lithuania. Historians have given this mass various names, such as "the Jagiellonian space," "Jagiellonian Europe," "Jagiellonian Central Eastern Europe,"

---

38 For elaboration on this point, see chapter "The GDL's Culture of Parliamentarism."

39 For discussion of the notion of homeland in the GDL's political nation, see J. Kiaupienė, "Naród polityczny Wielkiego Księstwa Litewskiego w XVI wieku: pojęcie ojczyzny," in *Łacina jako język elit*, ed. Jerzy Axer (Warsaw: Wydawnictwo DiG, 2004), 295–318.

and the "bloc of Jagiellonian states." What matters in terms of Lithuania's political culture, however, is not the set of names that historians have created to denote this territory but why the political nation of the Jogaila-ruled GDL did not identify with this territory and remained faithful to the space of their Lithuanian state.[40] Other possible answers to this question will be examined in Part 2 of this book, in which the makeup and manifestations of this political culture are treated.

---

40 Other questions pertaining to this issue are raised in S. C. Rowell, "Dynastic Bluff? The Road to Melnik, 1385–1501," *Lithuanian Historical Studies* 6 (2001): 21. Clarifying the process of the unions between Poland and Lithuania in 1385–1501, Rowell states: "In sum, in Poland-Lithuania in the late fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries there were at least three reasonably well-balanced political forces, that is, the Polish nobility, the Lithuanian nobility and the House of Jogaila to each of whom for various reasons the Union was necessary and desirable political conjuncture and we should not tidy up the dynamic 'on the hoof' politics of that age for some document-bound order that creates its own scholarly chaos." For some observations for further discussion, see J. Kiaupienė, "Naród polityczny Wielkiego Księstwa Litewskiego a przestrzeń jagiellońska," *Europa Orientalis* 1 (2009): 187–196.

3 The Mythological Space of the Political Culture of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania

Above I drew a picture of the geopolitical and geocultural realities of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania between the second half of the fifteenth century and the first half of the seventeenth, and described the conditions under which the political nation and political culture of the GDL formed and matured. This portrait, however, would remain unfinished if I did not discuss the story created at the turn of the early modern period about the Lithuanians' Roman origins (the legend of Palemon) and the inception of the Lithuanian state. This myth gave the ethno-political identity of the Lithuanian nation its shape and loomed large in the spiritual space of its political culture for centuries afterwards.

The legend about the arrival and settlement of Roman noble families in Lithuania during antiquity is known from late Lithuanian texts—the Chronicle of the Grand Dukes of Lithuania, the Chronicle of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania and Samogitia, and the Bychowiec Chronicle. Today, a large majority of researchers agree that the iterations of the legend in the last two-mentioned chronicles were created orally and committed to writing between the second half of the fifteenth century and the first half of the sixteenth.[1] The legend, its origins, and its ties with other ethno-genetic stories in Europe have been and are still being examined in various respects by ethnologists, historians, and culturologists.[2] Without elaborating on the entire history of research on the subject, I note that researchers have linked several themes in the Palemon legend with

---

1 The texts were published in "Khroniki Litovskaia i Zhmoitskaia, i Bychovtsa," vol. 32 of *Polnoe sobranie russkikh letopisei* (Moscow: Nauka, 1975); "Letopisi Belorussko-Litovskiie," vol. 35 of *Polnoe sobranie russkikh letopisei*, ed. N. N. Ulashchik (Moscow: Nauka, 1980).

2 For a comprehensive presentation and discussion of historiographical research on the Lithuanian chronicles, see J. Jurkiewicz, *Od Palemona do Giedymina. Wczesnowożytne wyobrażenia o początkach Litwy*, part 1: *W kręgu latopisów litewskich* (Poznań: Wydawnictwo Naukowe Uniwersytetu im. Adama Mickiewicza, 2013). Book review in English see: *Lithuanian Historical Studies* 18 (2013): 162–168.

political culture and reached important conclusions—which, however, do not create an all-encompassing picture in and of themselves.

Therefore, what follows is a closer look at the myth of the Roman origins of Lithuanians as a written product of the GDL's political culture in the sixteenth century. I will show how the protagonists of this mythological tale conspired with events to create signals of the historical and cultural memory of the political community and used them to fashion a program for the future of the state. Looking first at recent interpretations in historiography, I will present the links between the mythological tale about the Lithuanians' Roman origins and the GDL's political nation and culture in the period under discussion. Then I will reread the Palemon legend as a political and ideological concept of Lithuania as a state and discuss how mythology was used to create the idea and image of this state.

One may treat the Lithuanian chronicles *en bloc* as the first texts that yield an epic account of Lithuanian history. There is a difference, however, between the Chronicle of the Grand Dukes of Lithuania, written in the fifteenth century, and the later chronicles in terms of the political culture. The first-mentioned chronicle contains no sections that concern themselves with a legend. Historians have come around to the understanding that the Lithuanian tales in this opus were written at the initiative of the ruler and Lithuanian Grand Duke Vytautas.[3] Much debate persists, however, over who commissioned the later Lithuanian chronicles and where they were written. Weighing the ideological motives behind the legend sections of the later chronicles, the authors of the most recent studies seem convinced on solid grounds that these texts were initiated not by rulers but by members of the magnate class that made up the political nation and that gathered at the Council of Lords in the capital, Vilnius.

Historians highlight two main personalities who sired the texts that retell the Palemon legend and were instrumental in creating the GDL's policy and ideology: the GDL Chancellor and Vilnius Palatine Albert Gasztold (in Lithuanian, Goštautas) and Paweł Holszański (in Lithuanian, Alšėniškis), Bishop of Vilnius. The oral tradition that was current in their entourage was written down in the form of a story about the arrival of Duke Palemon (or, according to another version, Publius Libo) and five hundred Roman noble

---

3 For a broader look at the analysis of the first redaction of this text by Lithuanian historians, see A. Jovaišas, "Trumpojo Lietuvos metraščių sąvado literatūrinės ypatybės ir paslaptys," in *Metraščiai ir kunigaikščių laiškai*, vol. 4 of *Senoji Lietuvos literatūra*, ed. Algis Samulionis (Vilnius: Lietuvių literatūros ir tautosakos institutas, 1996), 22–61.

families, establishing the Lithuanian state and spearheading its expansion and development into the Grand Duchy. The authors and editors of the texts about the legend of Palemon are not known; we can only surmise that the chronicles were more or less the fruit of collective efforts. It is thought that politicians (perhaps even Chancellor Gasztold himself) provided guidelines and the composers of the written texts had to look among the educated, those who worked in the GDL chancellery, the chancellery of the Vilnius Palatinate, or the Bishopry of Vilnius. What matters for our context—the political culture—is that the legend of Palemon, a work born in an intellectual atmopshere, turned from scientific theory into a mythology that spoke to the hopes of Lithuanian society at the time, played an important role in the integration of the boyars, molded the boyars' historical identity, and provided their class with a universal weapon for political polemics against its opponents.[4]

Relative to other ethno-genetic tales in Europe, the legend of Palemon was relatively late in being written down in the Lithuanian chronicles. According to the cultural historian Gintaras Beresnevičius, however, the legend as presented in the chronicles retold an oral *tradition*. Beresnevičius links this tradition with the living legends of Lithuanians or their forefathers about their forefathers' arrival, which later was mythologized as it was placed in written form. The tradition was broken down through the prism of those who retold it and commemorated it in writing. It was edited and translated. The interests, motives, and ideologies of those who commissioned it reshaped it as they rendered it into text. The tradition itself, however, had been transmitted by word of mouth. Beresnevičius links the transmission of this oral tradition and its recording in the Lithuanian chronicles to the maturity of the state, arguing that a mature state must have its own ideology, its own forebears, and its own historical *ab ovo*.[5]

---

4 See R. Jasas, "Bychovco kronika ir jos kilmė," in *Lietuvos metraštis Bychovco kronika*, ed. Kostas Korsakas (Vilnius: Vaga, 1971), 8–38; M. Jučas, *Lietuvos metraščiai*, 44–126; R. Petrauskas, "Socialiniai ir istoriografiniai lietuvių kilmės iš romėnų teorijos aspektai," in *Literatūros istorija ir jos kūrėjai*, vol. 17 of *Senoji Lietuvos literatūra*, ed. Pietro Umberto Dini and Sigitas Narbutas (Vilnius: Lietuvių literatūros ir tautosakos institutas, 2004), 270–285; K. Gudmantas, "Lietuvių kilmės iš romėnų teorijos genezė ir ankstyvosios Lietuvos vardo etimologijos," in ibid., 245–269; K. Gudmantas, "Vėlyvųjų Lietuvos metraščių erdvė," *Darbai ir dienos* 44: *Senoji Lietuva. Viduramžiai, Renesansas, Barokas* (2005): 105–124; R. Petrauskas, "Lietuvos Didžioji Kunigaikštystė viduramžių Europoje: kultūrinės refleksijos apraiškos ir istorinės savimonės genezė," in *Lietuvos istorija*, vol. 4, 487–490; J. Jurkiewicz, *Od Palemona do Giedymina*, 66–89.

5 G. Beresnevičius, *Palemono mazgas. Palemono legendos periferinis turinys. Religinė istorinė studija* (Vilnius: Sapnų sala, 2003), 7, 52–53.

One may expound on Beresnevičius's thoughts while criticizing his line of thinking. For emphasis, Beresnevičius adds that the reception of ethno-genetic theories demands a certain level of education and communication. Thus, such stories were not born within gatherings of boyars but were created and written down by learned people. In examining the mythology of the Lithuanian chronicles as a product of the expression of political culture, however, one should not so quickly dismiss the ties with the ancient oral tradition and overlook the adaptation of the oral traditon to the needs of those producing the written chronicles. This oral tradition is attested in the Palemon legend by means of Lithuanian hydronyms, place names, and forms of proper names of mythological characters such as Palemon's sons, grandchildren, and great-grandchildren, including Barkus (Borcus), Kūnas (Cunonis), Spera, Gimbutas, Kernius (Kiernum), Mantvila (Montwilo), and Skirmantas (Skirmundo), among others.

The creation of the Palemon legend in its written redaction was an important step in giving ideological sense to the state and its political society. The legend shows the efforts of the political nation to introduce the history of the Lithuanian state and its establishment in a manner that would be understandable to an international audience in early modern Europe, emphasizing that this state had roots that stretched back to antiquity. The mythological image of geopolitical and geocultural space in the chronicles is not a glance into the past; instead, it is devoted to its contemporary readers and the posterity of politicians working for the Lithuanian state. The redactors of this mythological tale adopted a model of historical contemplation that was directed at the beginnings of the Lithuanian people, condensed it, and conveyed an ideology of a state that was said to be able to trace its inception to the end of the fourteenth century. Antipodally, this tale defined a specific path for those of future decades to follow. Thus, a country was able to confirm its importance by tying its recent past to a glorious ancient past in medieval and early modern Europe. Such was the enterprise of the politicians of sixteenth-century Lithuania.

In terms of political culture, it is important to point out that although the sixteenth-century Lithuanian chronicles are written in Ruthenian,[6] their form is predicated on the principles of Western historiography.[7] Works that were

---

6 Researchers of the language of the GDL's chancery, written in Cyrillic characters, still vacillate about what to call this tongue. They agree only that it was not the written language of the Muscovy state. This language, based on the written languages of Rus' lands, was developed in Lithuania and used as an official written language. In this book, we will call it Ruthenian.

7 See S. C. Rowell, "Amžinos pretenzijos arba kaip turime skaityti elitinę literatūrą?," in *Seminarai*, ed. A. Jokubaitis and A. Kulakauskas (Vilnius: Vyturys, 1998), 7–30.

recorded in Ruthenian but belonged to the Western chronicle tradition reflect both the forms of cultural integration and the development of ideas concerning the "nation" as a concept. This is proven by the fact that a common European tradition was thought through, adapted, and adopted in Lithuania in the first half of the sixteenth century—a tradition that gradually became one of the most important cultural phenomena in the GDL as well as a manifestation of an understanding among the educated segment of a society that belonged to Europe's Latin civilization. This following of a European tradition, however, did not constitute the adoption of a story about the origins of the Lithuanians that originated in earlier (fifteenth-century) authors such as Jan Długosz and Filippo Buonaccorsi. The inception of Lithuania's history as recorded in the Lithuanian chronicles, which was tied to a Roman and Christian past, was created in Lithuania.

One of the most important aspects of the Palemon legend, highlighted by historians, is helpful in trying to understand the political culture of Lithuania at the time. On the one hand, the legend emphasizes the Lithuanians' and Samogitians' inherited common Roman origins. On the other hand, this did not enjoin the Ruthenians of the GDL against taking part in Lithuanian politics. The Ruthenians, according to the myth, also had traditions of political activity and a political heritage that was suited to and compatible with the still-forming Lithuanian political nation. In this way, the theory of origins linked the entrenchment of the Roman Lithuanians in these eastern Ruthenian lands to the genesis of the Orthodox Ruthenian boyars and set the integration of the latter on ideological foundations. Thus, Orthodox boyar families in the GDL, such as the Chodkiewiczes (in Lithuanian—Chodkevičiai), the Sapiehas (in Lithuanian—Sapiegos), and the Tyszkiewiczes (in Lithuanian—Tiškevičiai), among others, could feel just as "Roman" and "Lithuanian" as did Catholic families—the Gasztolds, the Radziwiłłs (Radvilos), the Kieżgajłos (Kęsgailos), and so on. All of their ancestors were among those few hundred noble families who had accompanied Palemon from Rome to the shores of the Baltic. It was only later political events that scattered this group of people across the vastnesses of what became the Grand Duchy. Looking at their history, however, the Lithuanian, Samogitian, and Ruthenian boyars could have seen themselves not only as politically consolidated subjects of the grand dukes but also as one nation of boyars, a nation boasting an equality among members that is not impeded by differences in faith or language.[8] Such a view of the story of the

---

8 Rowell, "Amžinos pretenzijos," 26; Petrauskas, "Lietuvos Didžioji Kunigaikštystė viduramžių Europoje," 489–490.

nation's Roman origins explains the concept of "political Lithuanianness" as something that includes not only members of the society of one nation but also all who identify with the Lithuanian state. Indeed, this sixteenth-century "political Lithuanianness" became the society's ideological crux.

The historian Jan Jurkiewicz compellingly expands our current understanding of the legend. In the first part of his study,[9] he provides an overview of the steps set forth in all three chronicles in allfrom the Romans' arrival in the lands of the Samogitians and the Lithuanians to the foundation of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania, examines the sources that describe the historical landscape, and categorizes the sources into groups. He shows how the chronicle writers depict the GDL's landscape geographically and topographically, discusses research on the Palemon legend, and interprets the geopolitical and sociopolitical significance of, as well as the goals that could be hidden in, this legend about the Lithuanians' Roman origins. Jurkiewicz stresses that by the time the late Lithuanian chronicles were produced, the Grand Duchy of Lithuania already existed as a three-member state structure comprised of Lithuania, Samogitia, and Rus'. The redactors of the chronicles explained the genesis of this state structure, moving it to the legendary past. The internal makeup of this legendary state, clearly comprising Lithuania, Samogitia, and Rus' as structural components, did not correspond to the actual territorial and administrative borders of the state. This illustrates the tradition in the chronicles of seeing see the country as a common state organism, the cradle of the Lithuanian nation and the core of the state-in-formation, the Grand Duchy of Lithuania. In the mythology that they created, the authors of the Lithuanian chronicles bound the beginning of the state together with Lithuania and Samogitia, giving Lithuania the role of honor as the ruler. Kernavė, a city in Lithuanian territory, is the capital of the state according to the legend, and the expression "Duchy of Lithuania" always appears before the rulers' titles. At a later point in the legend of Palemon, the Ruthenian Duchy of Navahrudak appears. Although the legend has it that Navahrudak was established and ruled by dukes of the Palemon dynasty, it remains in the background compared with Lithuania and Samogitia. Its role is to defend the Lithuanian state from the Tatars, safeguard its expansion into Rus', and create a Lithuanian imperial power. The chronicle tradition, however, also note with emphasis that the Navahrudak dukes, descendents of Palemon, ruled great expanses of Rus' lands and remained Lithuanians in the political sense. However, not all the Rus' lands

---

9 Jurkiewicz, *Od Palemona do Giedymina.*

that belonged to the Grand Duchy of Lithuania received this kind of treatment. In Jurkiewicz's opinion, the legend presents the behavior of the Polotsk dukes, also of Palemon descent, in an entirely different way. Ginvilas, the son of Minigaila, who vanquished Polotsk, becomes Ruthenian. In the legend as depicted in the chronicles, Polotsk is an independent Ruthenian duchy that has nothing to do with Lithuania part from being ruled by dukes of Lithuanian origin. Thus the chronicle emphasizes the political Lithuanian-ness of some of the Ruthenian-inhabited territories that are linked to Navahrudak, as well as their belonging to the core of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania's empire together with Lithuania and Samogitia.

The plot of the Palemon legend, which recounts the Romans' voyage to Lithuania "on a sea-ocean" and their sailing to the interior of the country on the Nemunas River, is important in terms of the political culture of the GDL in the sixteenth century. In the Krasinski version of the second redaction of the Lithuanian chronicles, one finds a story about the departure of Duke Palemon and his maritime convoy from unrest that had beset Italy. As in many European myths about migration, they planned on heading west. The story tells the following:

> …Having traveled for a rather long time, they sailed to the Mediterranean Sea and reached the Shumo River [believed to be the Øresund Strait] and along that Shumo River [sailed] to the sea-ocean, and along the sea-ocean reached the mouth, where the Neman [Nemunas] River flows into the sea-ocean. Afterwards they sailed up the Neman until the lagoon, called the Small Lagoon, which is [also] called the Neman Lagoon (the Curonian Lagoon), and it is called that because there are twelve branches of the Neman that flow into the lagoon, each with its own name.[10]

The third redaction (the Bychowiec Chronicle) recounts the outset of the Romans' trip to Lithuania somewhat differently:

> He [Duke Palemon] left on the Mediterranean Sea, having taken one astronomer, who understood the stars. They sailed by ship on the sea to the north and, having passed France and England, sailed to the Kingdom of Denmark. In the Kingdom of Denmark they sailed to the sea-ocean (the

---

10 This is a translation from the Lithuanian translation published in Gudmantas, "Vėlyvųjų metraščių erdvė," 106.

Baltic Sea) and came on the sea-ocean to the mouth, where the Neman
River (having in mind the Strait of Klaipeda, and not the Nemunas River)
flows into the sea-ocean.[11]

From this point on, except for a few minor editing differences, the tale mirrors
that of the second redaction of the Lithuanian chronicle quoted above.

The plot of the sea-legend is not coincidental; it transcends mere trib-
ute to the European migration myth tradition. In this myth, one can see its
redactors' political and economic interests. At the time, Lithuania ruled only
a small strip of land on the Baltic coastline, between today's towns of Palanga
and Šventoji. The country had no port and was not seafaring. This is why the
symbolic geography of the legend of the Romans' arrival in Lithuania may have
been greatly influenced by the changing economic and political realities of the
sixteenth century.

Rowell pointedly observes that the introduction to the second redaction
of the Lithuanian chronicle describes trade routes from Western Europe to
Lithuania and the main river routes that linked the Baltic coast with the heart
of Lithuania. In his opinion, it is worth noting this perspective of how the coun-
try is described, that is, from west to east and not the other way around. (The
Romans did not have to take this route; they could have sailed to Lithuania
from Crimea if needed). A sea called the Shonai is mentioned (it is thought to
be the Øresund Strait), which everyone sailing between the North Sea and the
Baltic Seas would have crossed. The rivers of western Lithuania, flowing from
the agricultural and forested centers to the ports on the Baltic Sea, are marked.
One may also notice a paraphrasing of the agreement with the Teutonic Order
concerning the fate of the Samogitians—the Jūra and Dubysa rivers as well
as the mouth of the Neman with its various branches, each having its own
name: "*ubi dividitur Nemen aliis nominibus nuncupatus*." Remarking on the
Lithuanians' aggression against the Russians in mellifluous literary language,
the redactor reminds the reader of the struggle with the Teutonic Order for
Samogitia, in which the conquest of empty lands is mentioned.[12]

The "Nemunas Sea" plot in the legend of Palemon may be read as evi-
dence of the political nation's changed view of the sea, brought on as the
regional political situation began to change and the Baltic became a crossroads

---

11 This is a translation from the Lithuanian translation by Rimantas Jasas in *Lietuvos metraštis.
    Bychovco kronika*, 42–43.

12 Rowell, "Amžinos pretenzijos arba kaip turime skaityti elitinę literatūrą?," 14–15.

for international sea trade routes. The first international conflict to come to a head in the early modern period concerned domination of Livonia and the Baltic Sea.[13] The attitude of the political nation, which was comprised of landowners, began to change after Muscovy started a war for the purpose of seizing the ancient Rus′ lands that belonged to the Grand Duchy of Lithuania. In this clash, the GDL lost Smolensk and the Lower Dniepr and was threatened with the loss of Polotsk, Vitebsk, and the chance to use the trade routes of the Daugava River to reach the Baltic port of Riga. The redactor of the legend incorporated real events of the time into his account in an attempt to show that Lithuania had deep historical roots in the Baltic Sea and its ports and that its political claims in the region were legitimate. These, the most important plotlines of the Palemon legend as concerns the political culture, illuminate the way of thinking among the political nation's elite in the sixteenth century and the historiographic interpretations of today. They show how the redactors of this mythological tale constructed a collective historical memory for the GDL's political nation and its values, and set this active segment of the state's society within the geopolitical and geocultural European sphere of the early modern period.

This is how modern researchers read and understand the political aims of the creators of the legend of Palemon, basing themselves on textual analysis of the legend as recorded in the chronicles. But what was the response of GDL society during that period and in later times? How did they receive this story? Did the boyars embrace the myth of their Roman origins? How did the myth spread? It is much easier to ask these questions than to answer them. The reception of this legend in the society of the GDL from the second half of the sixteenth century to the first half of the seventeenth century has not been privileged with detailed research. The primary sources used by researchers who have dealt which this topic are the texts of ancient Lithuanian literature.[14]

---

13 J. Kiaupienė, "Baltijos jūros pasaulis—ankstyvųjų Naujųjų laikų kaitos erdvė," in *Lietuvos istorija*, vol. 5, 88–96. For a viewpoint in modern Russian historiography: Aleksandr Filiushkin, *Izobretaia pervuiu voinu Rossii i Evropy. Baltiiskie voiny vtoroi poloviny XVI veka glazami sovremennikov i potomkov* (Saint Petersburg: Dmitrii Bulanin, 2013).

14 The most important published texts on the topic are Michalonis Lituani, *De moribus tartarorum, lituanorum et Moschorum*, fragmina X, ed. I. Iac. Grasser (Basle: Conrad Waldkirch, 1615), translated as Mykolas Lietuvis, *Apie totorių, lietuvių ir Maskvėnų papročius, Dešimt įvairaus istorinio turinio fragment*, trans. Ignotas Jonynas (Vilnius: Vaga, 1966); Albertas Vijūkas-Kojelavičius, *Lietuvos istorija*, transl. Leonas Valkūnas, ed. Juozas Jurginis (Vilnius: Vaga, 1988); Šešioliktojo amžiaus raštija, vol. 5 of *Senoji Lietuvos literatūra*, ed. Sigitas Narbutas (Vilnius: Pradai, 2000); J. Radwan, *Radivilias sive de vita et rebus praeclarissime gestis*

Sources of the kind needed to carry out research on its reception by society and its con *Addite est oratio funebris* sequences in the second half of the sixteenth century and the first half of the seventeenth century (diaries, memoirs, and so forth), in contrast, are relatively few. Therefore, researchers lack the necessary details to create a comprehensive picture of the reception of the theory of Lithuanians' Roman origins. Thus, the question of just how broadly these stories about Palemon and the Romans spread within the contours of this enormous state at the time under discussion, and background details about their reception, remain open to new scholarship. Even now, however, we may offer observations that allow us to imagine the spread of the Lithuanians' Roman origins in the GDL and the effect of this legend on the country's political culture.

The intellectual environment created by humanism during the time in question was favorable to the spread of the Roman origins myth. Starting in the sixteenth century, members of society in the GDL began more intensively to extend their multifaceted contacts with artistic and scientific centers in Central and Western Europe and adopted their innovations. One can clearly see the creation of a new kind of individual and a new society.[15] The new cultural phenomena that had begun to flourish offered a field of opportunities that generated some outcomes already visible in the sixteenth century in some respects and others that came into sight only in the seventeenth century or later. Their further development depended on the geopolitical and cultural conditions of

---

immortalis memoriae illustrissimii principis Nicolai Radivili Georgii fillii, ducis in Dubinki ac Bierże, palatini Vilnensis etc ac exercitruum fortissimi etc libri quator.... *Addite est oratio funebris generosi domini Andrea Volani ... et quorundum auctorum epigrammata*, first edition (Vilnius, 1592) and second edition (Vilnius: Vaga, 1997). More information on the publishing of books in Latin in the GDL in fifteenth-seventeenth centuries, their authors and compilers, and their dissemination is provided by D. Narbutienė, *Lietuvos Didžiosios Kunigaikštijos lotyniškoji knyga XV–XVII a. (Le livre latin du Grand Duché de Lituanie au XV–XVIIe siècles)* (Vilnius: Lietuvių literatūros ir tautosakos institutas, 2004); S. Narbutas, "Latinitas in the Grand Duchy of Lithuania. Chronology, Specifics and Forms of Reception," in *Latinitas in the Polish Crown and the Grand Duchy of Lithuania. Its Impact on the Development of Identities*, ed. Giovanna Siedina (Florence: Firenze University Press, 2014): 145–161.

15 For more on the particular aspects of the spread of humanistic culture in the Central Eastern European context, see A. Gábor, *The Uses of Humanism: Johannes Sambucus (1531–1584), Andreas Dudith (1533–1589), and the Republic of Letters in East Central Europe*, part 1: *Humanist Learning and Networks in East Central Europe* (Leiden: Brill, 2009), 19–144. One should bear in mind that the author does not delve into the specifics of the spread of humanistic culture in the GDL, instead seeing the process as being linked through union ties from the end of the fourteenth century with the Kingdom of Poland, and thus not a separate GDL process but a Polish one.

the Lithuanian state and society. The most important factor in the formation of this new society, encouraging the creation of projects to improve on it, was the ever-changing reality of the Lithuanian state.[16]

These changes are evidenced in the extent of contact with West and Central European scientific and cultural centers. In the second half of the sixteenth century, the introduction of humanism and the heritage of antiquity became necessary for some members of the political nation who wished to participate in the life of the state. The new generation of magnates, eager to obtain public office, had to acquire an education suited to the calling. Therefore, scions of this class went on study tours and university visits (*peregrination academia*) and grand tours (*Kavalierstour*) of Europe. This corresponded to European trends at the time. Examining the development of Europe's novus homo and new society, the European cultural historian Peter Rietbergen emphasizes the importance of migration and the spread of travel. Travel, he says, had become a characteristic of early modern European society and a vehicle of cultural communication. To show its importance, he likens it to the invention of the printing press. Study tours played a crucial role in cultural communication and encouraged East European societies to adopt Western European culture.[17] The theory of the Roman origins of Lithuanians gave those leaving on trips abroad additional new ways to legitimize themselves in an atmosphere of humanistic culture. Returning to Lithuania, they instilled a new cultural atmosphere.

This new medium of communication accelerated the spread of writing and the press in the Grand Duchy of Lithuania, causing more and more new texts to appear. The proponents of humanistic ideals were the first progenitors of this new writing tradition. Throughout the sixteenth century, almost all genres that were characteristic of Central European writing, especially that of the Renaissance period, evolved in Lithuania: chronicles, histories, memorials, tracts, genealogies, dialogues, heroic poems, panegyrics and celebratory poetry, epigrams, amateur theatre plays, public addresses, speeches, public letters (particularly popular as literary works), journalism, and travel descriptions. The variety of genres and the general abundance shows that educated members of society had an entire arsenal of tools to express and discuss goings-on in the public sphere, were able to use them, created an aesthetic environment

---

16 For more on the most recent views in Lithuanian historiography, articulated by the Lithuanian culture historian Ingė Lukšaitė, see her "Paveldėta ir nauja kultūrinė erdvė," in *Lietuvos istorija*, vol. 5, 487–560.

17 See P. Rietbergen, *Europe. A Cultural History*, part 3: *Continuity and Change. New Ways of Looking at Man and the World* (London and New York: Routledge, 1998), 175–320.

that suited the spirit of the time, and communicated by literary means. The growth of the role of writing in the life of the state and society encompassed many other cultural phenomena. One of them was the advent of print. Starting in 1575, Vilnius became a beehive of printing presses, second only to Kraków in its concentration of presses in the Commonwealth of the Two Nations. Printing in the Lithuanian state developed commensurate with its evolution elsewhere in Central Eastern Europe.

It was in the core lands of the Lithuanian state that the new society developed with the greatest celerity. These areas were home to the most active members of the political nation; there they were able to congregate. It was also the place where the educated segment of society grew the most quickly. Taking these factors into account, cultural life there experienced change. However, the number of readers and creators of new texts that fit the new European Zeitgeist and humanistic culture was relatively small. The forms in which Renaissance culture could be expressed, variegated, and modified, as well as the interaction of "foreign" and local ideas, took on a condensed and illustrative shape mostly in sixteenth-century Vilnius, where the ruling elite of the state was centered, supporting the spread of humanistic culture.[18]

The changes in the reality of the Grand Duchy were strongly impacted and sped up by the Reformation. This phenomenon, arising from the west, became a dividing line for a culture that had belonged to the tradition of Latin Christianity.[19] Essentially, there was no Reformation either in the east or in the Byzantine world. When no Reformation came about, the Grand Duchy of Lithuania belonged to the sphere of Western Christianity but was on its easternmost fringe, a place where believers of various faiths cohabited. Thus, the

---

18 E. Ulčinaitė, *Lietuvos Renesanso ir Baroko literatūra* (Vilnius: Vilniaus universiteto leidykla, 2001), 14; for more detais on the multilingual literary culture of Vilnius see J. Niedźwiedź, *Kultura literacka Wilna (1323–1655). Retoryczna organizacja miasta* (Kraków: Wydawnictwo Prac Naukowych UNIVERSITAS, 2012).

19 For more on the Reformation in the GDL between the fifteenth century and first half of the seventeenth century, and its ties to culture, see I. Lukšaitė, *Reformacija Lietuvos Didžiojoje Kunigaikštystėje*; eadem, *Die Reformation in Grossfürsten Litauen und in Preussisch-Litauen (1520er Jahre bis zum Beginn des 17. Jahrhunderts)*, transl. Lilija Künstling and Gottfried Schneider (Leipzig: Leipziger Universitätsverlag GmbH, 2017); D. Pociūtė, *Maištininkų katedros. Ankstyvoji reformacija ir lietuvių-italų evangelikų ryšiai* (Vilnius: Versus aureus, 2008). In the European comparative context, the relationship between the state of Lithuania and Poland and the Church is analyzed by W. Kriegseisen, *Stosunki wyznaniowe w relacjach państwo-kościół między reformacją a* oświeceniem (Rzesza Niemiecka—Niderlandy Północne—Rzeczpospolita polsko-litewska (Warsaw: Wydawnictwo Naukowe Semper, 2010).

Reformation there took on unique traits in terms of religious consciousness and outlook. During the sixteenth century and, especially, in its second half, the ethno-confessional picture of society changed markedly as Evangelical Reformation, Lutheran, and Arian communities appeared alongside Catholics, Orthodox Christians, Karaites, and Jews.[20] Within a ten-year period starting in 1553, most noble families in the GDL, both Catholic and Orthodox, converted to Protestantism. In the sixteenth-century Lithuanian society, the need to change the policy of the Catholic Church matured. Society began to make new demands on the church, as they sought to reform the education system and to change the status of clergy in the state.[21] Some members of these families participated in the Council of Lords and, after 1569, became senators in the Commonwealth of the Two Nations; others were district-level officials.[22] The fissuring of the Orthodox Church into Uniate and Disuniate branches further exacerbated Lithuanian society's confessional fragmentation by the end of the century, as evidenced in the ecclesiastical Union of Brest in 1596.

---

20 The first Jews arrived in Lithuania in the twelfth century. Jewish settlements were organized into *kahals* (religious communities). Each hat its own synagogue, cementry, school, and court, and a measure of self-government provided by an elected council. Community members elected a rabbi to oversee reliogious affairs. At the end of the fourteenth century, when Lithuania was baptized, three non-Christian communities—Jews, Tatars, and Karaites (Karaims)—began to settle in the territory of the GDL and their legal and social status began to take shape. Originnaly from the Crimea, Karaims arrived in Lithuania during the Lithuanian invasions of the Black Sea area the end of the fourteenth century. Lithuanian Grand Duke Vytautas probably brought some Crimean Karaites to Trakai and other Lithuanian cities. Karaite religion is a form of Judaism that arose in the eight century and was considered heretical by rabbinical Jews. A dissident Jewish community, the Karaites were closely associated with the Tatars. Karaism took form in the ninth century among Babylonian-Persian Jews who rejected the Rabbiinc tradition and the Talmud. Karaites developed a religious literature of their own. In the period descried, of particular interest is an anti-Christian treatise by Isaac Abraham Troki, Lithuanian Karaite, (1533–1594), which later appeared in Latin translation. See Daniel Stone, *The Polish–Lithuanian State, 1386–1795* (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1984), 230–231; Jurgita Šiaučiūnaitė-Verbickienė and Larisa Lempertienė, ed., *Jewish Space in Central and Eastern Europe: Day–to–Day Histori* (Newcastle: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2007); Jurgita Šiaučiūnaitė-Verbickienė, "The Social and legal Status of Jews in the Grand Duchy of Lithuania and its Influences on the Status of Tatars and Karaites," *Central Europe* 8, no. 2 (November 2010): 65–86; Bronius Makauskas and Vytautas J. Černius, *History of Lithuania. From Medieval Kingdom to Modern Democracy* (New York: Lithuanian American Community, 2018), 115–117.

21 See Lukšaitė, *Die Reformation in Grossfürsten Litauen und in Preussisch-Litauen* (chapter "Incentives of Reformation in Lithuanian Society"), 344–349; eadem, "Paveldėta ir nauja kultūrinė erdvė."

22 Lukšaitė, *Reformacija Lietuvos Didžiojoje Kunigaikštystėje*, 253–257.

The Reformation quickly began to change public attitudes towards the value of cultural activities. The number of people working in creative work increased, as more and more people began to participate in the cultural life of society, which itself became more diverse and intensive. The number of secular thinkers who joined the ranks of writers grew, as did other groups in society that were able to participate in cultural processes that emerged throughout early modern Europe. In just one generation from the start of the Reformation in sixteenth-century Lithuania, an active collective jelled of creative individuals who considered writing a modality of personal self-expression, laying down ideas in written form as a way to immortalize their views and themselves. Written texts and published books began to be viewed as monuments for future centuries and acts of creation of history. Works of history, in turn, were transformed not only into universal sources for acquaintance with the world but also into part of the foundation of an ideology being created**.** The historiography of humanism became the most influential creator of social consciousness and the awakener of national and state identity. The progenitors of this historiography based their work on their understanding of the societies of Antiquity and the Renaissance, popularized by the achievements of European universities in interpreting ancient history works, along with their knowledge about the structure of European states and their history.[23]

In the writings that date to the creation of this new society, one senses the authors' wish to overcome the divisions between various ethnocultural communities and the united citizen or the political nation. This attitude sets the political society of the GDL apart from other societies in the region during the early modern period. The Lithuanian historian Darius Kuolys describes this as the aim of a nation-state to demarcate the contours of a society that recognizes a common cultural tradition. The vision of this kind of society, Kuolys states, is predicated on several models of state and society.[24]

By the middle of the sixteenth century, some of Lithuania's intellectual elite already considered the Lithuanian language an essential trait of the Lithuanian

---

23 See D. Kuolys, *Asmuo, tauta, valstybė. Lietuvos Didžiosios Kunigaikštystės istorinėje literatūroje. Renesansas, Barokas* (Vilnius: Mokslo ir enciklopedijų leidykla, 1992); Lukšaitė, *Reformacija Lietuvos Didžiojoje Kunigaikštystėje*; Ulčinaitė, *Lietuvos Renesanso ir Baroko literatūra*. On changes in the use of languages in Lithuanian public life during the sixteenth century, see *Lietuvos istorija*, vol. 5, 569–578.

24 D. Kuolys, "Visuomenės raidos projekcijos XVI amžiaus Lietuvos Didžiosios Kunigaikštystės raštijoje," in *Šešioliktojo amžiaus raštija*, vol. 5 of *Senoji Lietuvos literatūra*, ed. Sigitas Narbutas (Vilnius: Pradai, 2000), 10–14.

nation and invested efforts to encourage the public to use it for everyday conversations as well as for intellectual pursuits. The the first printed book in Lithuanian, Martynas Mažvydas' *Catechism*,[25] published in 1547 and dedicated to the Grand Duchy of Lithuania, represents this stance. The *nostra gens* of this book is linked to the *lingua Lituanica nostra*. This position is also represented by the works of the Lithuanian language specialists Abraomas Kulvietis (Abraham Culvensis, 1510?–1545), Stanislovas Rapalionis (Stanislaus Rapagellanus, 1485–1545), and Jurgis Zablockis (1510?–1563). The Samogitian Bishop Merkelis Giedraitis (Melchior Giedroyć, 1536?–1609) and Medininkai canon Mikalojus Daukša (1527?–1613) considered Lithuanian the most important basis for the society's identity. In his Polish foreword to the postilles that were published in Lithuanian in 1599 (*Izguldymas Ewangeliu ... per kunigą Mikaloiv Davksza*), Daukša declared Lithuanian to be the most trustworthy "guardian of the state," the "father of civic pride and duty," and the primary source of support for the nation and state. Lithuanian, Daukša predicted, would become the language of public life in Lithuania. Not only Lithuanians ("our own") should be required to use it; so should other citizens of the country. Daukša suggested that the foundation of the state rest not on ancient Latin but on Lithuanian, the native language of the country's fathers and forefathers.

A second model, a Ruthenian state as a social model for the GDL, was represented by the three Lithuanian Statutes written in Cyrillic (1529, 1566, and 1588)—polemical Ruthenian works—and the Lithuanian chronicles. The creators of Lithuania's Ruthenian written culture, Simonas Budnas (Szymon Budny, 1530–1593) and Vasily Tyapinsky (1530?–1609), urged everyone to "love the language of the Ruthenian nation." In his foreword to the 1588 Third Lithuanian Statute, written in Ruthenian, the publisher of the document, Leon Sapieha (1557–1633) commented with emphasis that a body of state legal acts should be written in the nation's language, and not a foreign one.[26]

---

25 Full title: *Catechismusa prasty szadei, makslas skaitima raschta yr giesmes del kriksczianistes bei del berneliu iaunu nauiey sugulditas.*

26 Sergejus Temčinas, in his article "The Ruthenian literature of the Grand Duchy of Lithuanian as a Model of cultural Integration," in *Lietuvos Didžiosios Kunigaikštijos tradicija ir tautiniai naratyvai*, ed. Alfredas Bumblauskas and Sigitas Jegelevičius (Vilnius: Vilniaus universiteto leidykla, 2009), 53–85, presents a survey of translations made from different languages (Old Church Slavonic, Hebrew, Czech, Polish, Latin, and Greek) into Ruthenian in both the Grand Duchy of Lithuania and the Kingdom of Poland. His survey shows a large variety of literary genres and individual texts which have been translated into Ruthenian from different—Western and Eastern—sources. It is shown that the Ruthenians produced the largest quantity of translations in their region, so that the Ruthenian literature may by viewed as a

To elucidate, the myth of origin is generic. Its content is much wider and deeper. It is therefore possible to talk about theory that Lithuanians originated from the Romans. One should focus in this context on the role of texts about the legend of Palemon, recorded in Ruthenian in the Lithuanian chronicles, as a factor that spurred the spread of this myth until it became a concept in the sixteenth century. Thus, the culture of the Lithuanians' purported forefathers promoted Latin and Roman culture in Lithuania and allowed a vision to form of a Lithuania state based on Latin, a system of laws greatly impacted by Roman law, and a Latin-language school system. An international assortment of intellectuals (Lithuanian, Polish, and of other European nationalities) began to foster the theory that Latin is in fact the Lithuanians' true language ("*idioma Lithuanorum olim latinum fuisse*") and should be revived. Although all of them pledged their lives and ouevres to Lithuania, they were united not by their origins but by their service in the royal court, the GDL chancellery, and the magnates' courts, and their cultural baggage was wholly humanistic.

The Latin concept of social development is explained by Michalonis Lituani (Venclovas Mikalojaitis, 1490?–1560)[27] and Wenceslaus Agrippa (1525?–1597).[28] It was Augustinas Rotundas (1520?–1582) who, in a letter to Stephen Báthory (r. 1576–1586)[29] on October 20, 1576, laid down perhaps the most comprehensive and well-founded program for the basing of

---

vivid model of cultural integration within the Grand Duchy of Lithuanian and beyond. It should be noted that Ruthenian started functioning as a literary language as early as the middle of the fifteenth century, when the first translations from at least three languages—Hebrew, Czech, and Latin—were produced. Temčinas's paper also discusses the possibility of giving a general definition of the multilingual Ruthenian literature (as opposed to the multilingual Lithuanian literature) based on formal criteria such as geography, faith, language, and script. The last criterion, while far from being ideal, appears to be most suitable, since the Cyrillic script (which was considered emblematic by the Ruthenian themselves) has been normally applied to both Old Church Slavonic and Ruthenian—the two main literary languages of the Ruthenian people (who also used Latin and especially Polish, but to a lesser extent).

27 Michalonis Lituani, *De moribus tartarorum*. Lituani, who was raised in humanist thought, writes about Lithuanians in the following way: "We learn the science of Muscovy, which is not ancient at all and does not raise virtuousness in oneself at all, because Russian is a foreign language to us Lithuanians, that is, Italians, who are of Italian blood." Lituani's life and work is discussed in A. Jovaišas, *Martynas Mažvydas: pirmosios lietuviškos knygos parengėjas* (Kaunas: Šviesa, 1996).

28 In his *Oratio funebris de illustrissimi principis et domini Johannis Radzivili ... vita et morte* (Viteberg, 1553).

29 The letter is published in Latin in *Archiwum Komisji Prawniczej*, vol. 7, part 1: *Pomniki prawa litewskiego z XVI wieku*, ed. Franciszek Piekosiński (Kraków: Polska Akademia Umijętności, 1900), XV–XXII.

the Lithuanian state on its "native" Latin culture. According to Rotundas, the language of the Romans, helped along by the Vilnius Jesuit College and other schools, should push Ruthenian, which was foreign to the Lithuanians, out of public life, thereby strengthening the foundations of the state and bringing the Lithuanian nation together. By writing the law in the language of their Roman "forefathers," Rotundas believed, a clear, just order of life for the nation would be then set down. Efforts to implement this vision of a Latin Lithuania in a practical way were made in what is thought to be Rotunda's translation of the 1566 Second Lithuanian Statute from Ruthenian into Latin, accompanied by a text titled *Epitome principum Litauniae a migratione italorum P. Libone vel, ut Lituanica historia scribit, Palemone duce usque ad Jagellones.*[30] The works of the Lithuanian writer Jan Radwan (in Latin, Ioannes Radvanus; in Lithuanian, Jonas Radvanas) continually stress the Lithuanians' Roman origins and their ties to antiquity. This includes his most important opus as a poet, a heroic epic pulsating with Lithuanian patriotism called *Radivilias, sive De vita et rebus praeclarissime gestis immortabilis memoriae illustrissimi principis Nicolai Radivili ... libri,* published in 1592.[31] Radwan not only glorifies his main character, a Radziwiłł duke Mikalojus Radvila Rudasis (*illustrissimi principis Nicolai Radivili*) and his campaigns, but also paints a portrait of Lithuanian history from the mythical journey of Publius Libo—namely, Palemon—to Lithuania up to the end of the sixteenth century. The legendary "Romans" and historical figures, in Radwan's depiction, defend the Lithuanian state and glorify it.

In the second half of the sixteenth century, a unified secondary and higher-education system with Latin as its foundation began to take shape under Jesuits who had been invited for this purpose by Walerian Protasewicz (in Lithuanian—Valerijonas Protasevičius) (1504–1579), the Bishop of Vilnius. A college began to operate in Vilnius in 1570, and in 1579 the Commonwealth leader Stephen Báthory issued a privilege for the establishment of a Vilnius academy and university (*Alma academia et universitas Vilnensis Societatis Jesu*). In the same year, Pope Gregory XIII approved the establishment of Vilnius University. Bishop Protasewicz, having entrusted the Jesuits with this work, was

---

30 The Latin original with Sigitas Narbutas's translation into Lithuanian is published in *Šešioliktojo amžiaus raštija*, vol. 5 of *Senoji Lietuvos literatūra*, ed. Sigitas Narbutas (Vilnius: Pradai, 2000), 286–305.

31 The Latin original with a translation into Lithuanian is published in Jonas Radvanas, *Radviliada*, ed. and transl. Sigitas Narbutas (Vilnius: Vaga, 1997). See also S. Narbutas, *Tradicija ir originalumas Jono Radvano "Radviliadoje"* (Vilnius: Lietuvių literatūros ir tautosakos institutas, 1998).

said to have stated that he not only wanted to glorify God and was interested solely in Church issues but wished to emphasize that he cared about matters of the state and his homeland.

The education system created by the Jesuits conduced to the spread of the Roman-origins theory in Lithuanian society. The Jesuits who worked in Lithuania developed close ties with the magnates and boyars, the highest state officials; observed the work of the Sejms; and understood early on the meaning of history as a separate branch of education. In an epoch in which the various confessions adapted to the changing society and evolving needs of the early modern period, the Jesuit order was able to adjust to the cultures of Central Eastern Europe and envisioned a suitable strategy and tactics to attain its goals. Although members of the Society of Jesus were enjoined against directly interfering in politics, politically motivated Jesuits were active in fostering and creating a political culture during the early modern period. This was characteristic of Jesuits who worked in Lithuania at the time.[32] In 1609, they addressed the leadership of their society, requesting permission to teach history as a separate discipline. Their entreaty was based on a demand from Lithuanian magnates and boyars that the children of the nobility receive appropriate education in all the requisites of participation in public political life, the kind of schooling that would impart skills with which members of this class could take part in Sejm or court debates. The Superior General of the Society, Claudio Acquaviva, turned down their request to revise and modernize the *ratio studiorum* (curriculum). Thus, history continued to be treated as a supplementary discipline of rhetoric. However, of course, lectures on history were read to listeners of rhetoric courses at the Vilnius Academy in the seventeenth century.

The Kaunas-born Lithuanian Jesuit Wojciech Wijuk Kojałowicz (in Lithuanian—Albertas Vijūkas-Kojalavičius) (1609–1677) made a prodigious contribution to these efforts.[33] This is reflected in his two-volume history of Lithuania, written in Latin (*Historiae Lituanae pars prior: De rebus Lituanorum ante susceptam Christianam religionem coniunctionemque Magni Lituaniae Ducatus cum Regno Poloniae libri novem* (1650), and his *Historiae Lituanae a coniuctione*

32 See J. Kiaupienė, "Petro Skargos *Seimo pamokslai* ir Abiejų Tautų Respublikos bajorų politinės kultūros kraštovaizdis," in Petras Skarga, *Seimo pamokslai. Kvietimas atgailauti Lenkijos Karalystės ir Lietuvos Didžiosios Kunigaikštystės piliečiams* (Vilnius: Lietuvių literatūros ir tautosakos institutas, 2014), 23–40.

33 See Z. Kiaupa, "Alberto Kojalavičiaus ir jo brolių kilmė bei šeima," in Albertas Vijūkas-Kojalavičius, *Lietuvos istorijos įvairenybės*, part 2 (Vilnius: Lietuvių literatūros ir tautosakos institutas, 2004), 356–367.

Magni Ducatus cum Regno Poloniae ad unionem eorum dominiorum libri octo
(1669). He also wrote a guide on the coats-of-arms of the GDL in both Latin
and Polish (in Latin—*Nomenclator familiarum et stemmatum Magni Ducatus
Lituaniae et provinciarum ad eum pertinentiam,* and in Polish—*O klejnotach albo
herbach których familie stanu stanu rycerskiego w prowincjach Wielkiego Księstwa
Litewskiego zażywają*)[34] as well as a *Chronicle of the Radziwiłłs* (*Fasti Radiviliani
gesta illvstrissimae domvs DVCVM Radziwił compendio continentes*), published as a
separate book at the Jesuit Society's academic printing press in Vilnius in 1653.[35]

In his works, Kojałowicz traces the roots of the Lithuanian magnate
Radziwiłł family back to a legendary line of Lithuanian grand dukes, which
had a centurian coat-of-arms and descended from a Roman patrician who
had accompanied Duke Palemon to Lithuania.[36] These texts, written by this
Lithuanian historian in the seventeenth century, mark the end of the first stage
of the spread of the legend of Palemon both domestically as well as internation-
ally. Kojałowicz's works, which he wrote in Latin, expanded the foundations
of historical and cultural memory and firmly established the ties of the early
modern GDL with the past of the nation and the state.

Today, Kojałowicz's historical works are seen as exemplars of the Jesuit his-
toriographical canon.[37] In examining this consensus, however, Moreno Bonda
overlooks the legend of Palemon in favor of other plotlines in *Historiae Lituaniae*:

> In literature, the obvious result of the foregoing consideration is that an
> attempt to orient the conscience by acting on memory, sensibility, and

---

34 The Latin version exists only in manuscript form. A translation of a small part of it was
published in Polish in 1905. Another Polish version was published in 1897: D. Antanavičius,
"Radvilų kunigaikštiskos kilmės teorijos genezė Alberto Vijuko Kojalavičiaus genealog-
iniuose darbuose," in *Istorijos akiračiai. Skiriama Profesoriaus habilituoto daktaro Antano
Tylos 75-mečiui,* ed. E. Rimša and A. Tyla (Vilnius: Lietuvos istorijos instituto leidykla,
2004), 235–240.

35 The Latin version of the " Chronicle of the Radziwiłłs" with Darius Antanavičius's transla-
tion into Lithuanian, is published in Albertas Vijūkas-Kojalavičius, *Lietuvos istorijos įvaireny-
bės,* part 1 (Vilnius: Lietuvių literatūros ir tautosakos institutas, 2003), 218–476.

36 For more on the genealogy of the Radziwiłł dukes and their ties with the mythology of the
Lithuanians' Roman origins, see M. Antoniewicz, "Rodowód książąt Radziwiłłów w dziełach
Alberta Wijuka Kojałowicza," in *Albertas Vijūkas-Kojalavičius iš 400 metų perspektyvos,* vol.
27 of *Senoji Lietuvos literatūra,* ed. Sigitas Narbutas (Vilnius: Mokslo ir Enciklopedijų
Leidykla, 2009), 181–214; M. Antoniewicz, *Protoplaści książąt Radziwiłłów. Dzieje mitu i
meandry historiografii* (Warsaw: Wydawnictwo DiG, 2011).

37 See M. Bonda, "Jesuits' Historiographic Canon in the Works of A. Wijuk-Koialowicz in
the Age of the Historical Revolution (1580–1661), PhD dissertation, Vytautas Magnus
University; Kaunas, 2011.

imagination should be realized through the "reinvention" of historical events that can easily evoke pre-logical sensations. This, in turn, may be atrtained both by using terms that evoke sensations and by describing dramatic events wrapped in myth. This was the method that the ecclesiastical polemists adopted to support their own theses. They had recourse to a mystic tenor of expression that evokes fears, majesty, or the supernatural. These criteria are satisfied by a series of examples in the first book of *Historiae Lituaniae*.[38]

One may, however, expand on his idea by saying that Kojałowicz used the myth of the Lithuanians' Roman origins as a rhetorical device.

> In his *Historiae Lituaniae*, Kojałowicz connects the personalities and the mythical events of the Palemon legend with historical reality. Thus, in the chapter titled "On the Lithuanians' Past: When Palemon's Family Returned to Power," he writes that the thirteenth-century Lithuanian ruler Mindaugas, whom he calls Lithuania's first and last king, designated Mindaugas as the successor to Rimgaudas, the son of Palemon's grandson Gimbutas and the first Lithuanian ruler to declare himself grand duke. Likewise, he calls a historical figure, Mindaugas's son Vaišvilkas, a representative of the Palemonid dynasty.[39] Kojałowicz deduces other links of similar nature between the Palemon family and real-life rulers of the GDL. His goal is to create a convincing historical tale about the inception of the Lithuanian state, allowing me to concur with Kuolys's idea that all of Kojałowicz's historical texts may be read as an ideologically unified historical account. Kojałowicz's works were part of a long-term educational program for the country's boyars, who supported the Lithuanian Jesuits and their exertions—an enterprise that, along with a universal Christian character, had a clear patriotic and civic bent. The Lithuanian Jesuits strove to turn their students into people enlightened by humanistic values and equipped with skills to participate in public

---

38   Ibid., 146.

39   For the original Latin see Alberto Wiiuk Koialowicz, *Historiae Lituanae pars prior: De rebus Lituanorum ante susceptan Christianam religionem coniunctionemque Magni Lithuaniae Ducatus cum Regno Poloniae libri novem* (Danzig: Sumptibus Georgii Färsteri, 1650); idem, *Historiae Lituanae a coniunctione Magni Ducatus cum Regno Poloniae ad unionem eorum dominiorum libri octo* (Antwerpen: Jacobus Meursius, 1669). The Lithuanian translation is published as Albertas Vijūkas-Kojalavičius, *Lietuvos istorija*, 97–98, 124.

life. It is no coincidence that one of the primary authors whose texts were studied in Jesuit schools was Marcus Tullius Cicero (106 BC–43 BC); through his works, the Jesuits elevated traditional Roman virtues such as service to society and state, extolled the importance of political work, and asserted the existence of a direct link between the well-being of the state and the morality of its citizens.[40]

The Palemon legend is reflected in the genealogical identity and heraldry of Lithuanian magnate families that traced their origins back to Palemon and the Romans who accompanied him.[41] Just as these families linked their genealogy with Roman origins, the magnates' courts also knew the legend of Palemon and prized its importance. This attitude among the magnate class fostered the Roman-origin myth among the boyars.

Thus, two primary concepts concerning national culture during the Renaissance intertwined harmoniously in Lithuania: the "northern" Germanic concept, which sought support for the claim of Lithuania as a "northern" Germanic state in medieval ecclesiastical works, and the "southern" Italian view, which saw works from Antiquity as a source of their homeland's strength.[42] Texts that propagated the Roman-origins legend show that the elite, which created the concept of Lithuania in the sixteenth century, adopted Latin culture as a program endowed with a fully formed set of ideals and concurrently served as a force that created, disseminated, protected, and shared Europe's cultural heritage. These ideals had a noticeable impact on society because the champions of Latin culture did more than write literary works; they were also active in influencing groups of officials whose brief included the implementation of state-level reforms.[43]

---

40 See D. Kuolys, "Alberto Vijūko-Kojalavičiaus istorinis pasakojimas: Respublikos kūrimas," in Albertas Vijūkas-Kojalavičius, *Lietuvos istorijos įvairenybės*, part 2 (Vilnius: Lietuvių literatūros ir tautosakos institutas, 2004), 368–412.

41 See A. Railaitė-Bardė, *Lietuvos Didžiosios Kunigaikštystės kilmingųjų genealoginė savimonė ir jos atspindžiai heraldikoje XVI–XVIIIa*, PhD dissertation, Vilnius University, Vilnius, 2013.

42 Kuolys, *Asmuo, tauta, valstybė*, 70.

43 For more on the political doctrine that strove for the domination of Latin in education, state institutions, and the Church, see S. Narbutas, "Lietuvių kilmės iš romėnų legenda kultūrinės integracijos šviesje," in *Literatūros istorija ir jos kūrėjai*, vol. 17 of *Senoji Lietuvos literatūra*, ed. Pietro Umberto Dini and Sigitas Narbutas (Vilnius: Lietuvių literatūros ir tautosakos institutas, 2004), 286–315.

Kuolys identifies a fourth model that existed in the GDL at this time: a Polish-Sarmatian cultural model, based less on manifestos or a well-delineated ideology than on practices in everyday life. Sharing statehood with the Kingdom of Poland under a single ruler's control from the early sixteenth century onward, GDL magnates and boyars had no choice but to make ever-growing use of the Polish language. Janusz Radziwiłł (in Lithuanian—Jonušas Radvila) expressed this situation in rueful remark in a 1615 letter to his cousin: "...Though I was born a Lithuanian and am fated to die a Lithuanian, we have to use Polish in our homeland."[44] Alongside other languages that were regularly spoken and written at various levels of society in the structurally complex GDL, Polish first came into use as a lingua franca in the middle of the sixteenth century. This novelty began to change each ethnic community's perspectives on its choice of internal vernacular. Language ceased to be a factor that determined one's ties to a particular community. Instead, explanations relating to ethnic self-awareness and origins became influential in determining how individuals viewed themselves—explanations that often intermingled in unexpected ways. It was on this account that several iterations of the myth of the Lithuanians' Sarmatian origins appeared alongside the tale of their Roman extraction in Lithuanian literature and historical sources.

One version of the Sarmatian-origin account is represented by a long poem written in Latin by the aforementioned Jan Radwan in Vilnius in the late the sixteenth century: *Epitalamium in nuptias illustrissimi ac magnifici domini d. Christophori Monvidi Dorohistayski, Magni Ducatus Lituaniae incisoris, praefecti Volcoviscensis, etc. et generosiss, ac illustris virginis d. Sopphiae Chodkieviciae, comitissae in Sklov et Mysz ... poetice expressum a Ioanne Radvano, Vilnae, [1588?]*). It depicts Lithuania as a country near Sarmatia: *Sarmatiae vicina,* "neighbor of Sarmatia." Radwan's account clearly separates "the Poles—a noble nation named after their forefather Lech" from "Lithuanians—of different origins, having come from the Romans."[45] It seems that Radwan's view was influenced by a work written in Latin by Marcin Kromer and published in Basel in 1568, *De origine et rebus gestis Polonorum.* Kromer lived for a time in Vilnius, where he put Sigismund Augustus' library in order. He traced the Poles and the Slavic nations to the same "Sarmatian" origins but distinguished the Lithuanians from them as an ethnically unique nation linked to the Poles by political ties only.[46]

---

44 Kuolys, "Visuomenės raidos," 13–14.

45 See I. Lukšaitė. "Etniniai, kalbiniai procesai, identitetų kaita Lietuvos Didžiojoje Kunigaikštystėje ir Mažojoje Lietuvoje," in *Lietuvos istorija*, vol. 5, 587–588.

46 Ulčinaitė, *Lietuvos Renesanso ir Baroko literatūra*, 40.

Another version of the legend of the Lithuanians' Sarmatian roots originates in Lithuanian writings in the Kingdom of Poland. This origin theory began its dissemination at the turn of the sixteenth century in the Polish king's court and chancellery, Kraków University, and the university's capitula, the working place of a number of literati who pursued humanistic ideals. It was there that the idea of telling the nation's history was born, and there this group began to promote the theory of a "European Sarmatia." It was not only Poland that came from Sarmatia, Jan of Stobnica wrote, but also other lands in Central Eastern Europe, including Lithuania ("*nunc Polonia, Massouia, Prussia, Lituania, Curlandia, Samethia, Liuonia, Russia et Gottia*"). At the beginning of the sixteenth century, Maciej Miechowita published a geography of the two Sarmatias: *Tractatus de duabus Sarmatiis Europiana et Asiana et de contentis in eis* (first printing in Kraków in 1517). In what became a widely popular work, Miechowita asserts that geographic Sarmatia covered all of Europe east of the Vistula River. The spread of this theory in the Kingdom of Poland awakened aims among Poles to find their ancient roots in Sarmatia and to endow this place name, otherwise a geographical term, with political meaning. Long after the victory of the King of Poland and the Grand Duke of Lithuania Sigusmundus the Old over the Muscovite army in the Battle of Orsha in 1514, "Sarmatia" was even included in the title of the Polish King and Lithuanian Grand Duke Sigismund the Old: "*dominum Sigismundum, regem Poloniae, magnem Ducem Lithuaniae, Russiae, Prussiae, Sarmatiaque Europeae dominum et haerendem.*"

In the sixteenth century, the political echelon in the Kingdom of Poland and the Grand Duchy of Lithuania began to use the term Sarmatia to denote the entire territory ruled by the Jagiellonian dynasty, of which the GDL was a part. Polish politicians invoked works by historians to consolidate all of these lands. True to this concept of Sarmatia, Maciej Miechowita ties the theory of Sarmatia to the history of Poland (and Lithuania) in his *Chronika Polonorum* (first printing 1519; second corrected and appended edition by Decius [Justus Lodovicus, 1485–1545] published in 1521).[47] Examining the humanistic national historiography of Poland that came about in Jagiellonian Kraków in 1500–1700, Hans-Jürgen Bömelburg calls Miechowita's *Chronika Polonorum* a part of a program that sought to create a Sarmatian *Staatsvolk*.[48]

---

47 Justus Ludovicus Decius was editor of Miechowita's *Chronica Polonorum* and autor of several historical works. For more information, see Maria Cytowska, "Justus Ludovicus Decius," in *Contemporaries of Erasmus. A Biographical Register of the Renaissance and Reformation*, vol. 1, ed. P. G. Bietenholz (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1985), 380–382.

48 For more on Kraków as a center of community, the adoption of the vision of humanistic history, the formulation of the concept of Sarmatia, and the program for creating a Sarmatian

But how did the Sarmatian theory coexist with the myth of the Lithuanians' Roman origins in the culture of the GDL? Maciej Strykowski (1547?–1593?), who lived and worked in the GDL for several decades in the sixteenth century and wrote in Polish, is considered by researchers to be the prime architect of this fusion. In all of Stryjkowski's voluminous literary output, two works devoted to Lithuanian history and mythology stand out. The first, written in 1576–1578 at the estate of Yury Olelkovich, Duke of Slutsk, is *O początkach, wywodach, dzielnościach, sprawach rycerskich i domowych sławnego narodu litewskiego, żemojdzkiego i ruskiego, przedtym nigdy od żadnego ani kuszone, ani opisane, z natchnienia Bożego a uprzejmie pilnego doświadczenia* [On the genesis, descent, courage, and valiant endeavors of the Lithuanians, Samogitians, and Ruthenians]. Not published until the second half of the twentieth century, it was known only in its manuscript version, the Nieśwież Manuscript—narrowing the potential readership of its version of the legend of Palemon. The second work, written while Stryjkowski was living in Samogitia, was published in 1582 and gave Stryjkowski most of his fame: *Która przed tym nigdy świata nie widziała, Kronika Polska, Litewska, Żmódzka y wszystkiej Rusi Kijowskiey, Moskiewskiey, Podgórskiey, etc. y rozmaite przypadki woienne y domowe Pruskich, Mazowieckich, Pomorskich y inszych krain Krolestwu Polskiemu i Wielkiemu Xięstwu Litewskiemu przyległych* [Chronicle of Poland, Lithnuania, Samogitia...].

Stryjkowski's work as a historian was supported by GDL magnates. His *Chronicle*, written in Polish, quickly gained popularity and became the most important source of information about the history of Lithuania and the Lithuanians' origin myths that was easily accessible to society. The factographical material used by Stryjkowski in his *Chronicle* is also mentioned by Kojałowicz in his *History of Lithuania*: "It [the material for *History of Lithuania*] was not reassembled as the result of my labor but picked from the chronicles of Maciej Strykowski (*ex analibus M. Stryikovii expertam*)."

Strykowski used humanistic and Polish works on historical themes. The novelty in his factography was his use of the Lithuanian chronicles written in Ruthenian. Strykowski adopted the story about Palemon from these works, greatly expanded the number of legendary locations from the chronicles,

---

state-nation, see H.-J. Bömelburg, *Polska myśl historyczna a humanistyncza historia narodowa (1500–1700),* transl. Zdizsław Owczarek, with introduction by Andreas Lawaty (Kraków: Universitas, 2011), 71–159. Originally published as H.-J. Bömelburg, *Frühneuzeitliche Nationen im östlichen Europa. Das polnische Geschichtsdenken und die Reichweite einer humanistischen Nationgeschichte (1500–1700)* (Wiesbaden: Harrasowicz Verlag, 2006).

and added more detail to the theory of the Lithuanians' Roman origins.[49] Strykowski lived at around the time the Lithuanian chronicles were written and knew his contemporary and ancient literature. It is no surprise that he supplemented the chronicles with his own knowlege and observations. He traveled widely and visited the locations mentioned in the chronicles. He elaborated on this in his *Chronicle:*

> Wishing to witness everything in writing with arguments and personal experience, I consciously and purposefully left Liba (today Liepaja) towards Klaipeda, or Memel.... There, where [stood] Liba and Klaipeda, there was food aplenty; it seems that in those lands Duke Libo, or Palemon, with his Italians (just like Eneida with his Trojans, when he wandered the seas for a long time and experienced much danger, arriving in Italy from Africa) were able to rest....[50]

Since then, a rather extensive historiography has looked into Strykowski's historical works, with no lack of conflicting opinions. When one speaks about the mythological space of the GDL's political culture, one must bear in mind that Strykowski wrote more than a decade after the Commonwealth of the Two Nations had come into being and favored the Poland-Lithuania union. Striving to integrate the stories of the Roman and Sarmatian origins of the Lithuanians, the Poles, and the Ruthenians, he told the tale of a Sarmatian country that united the boyars of Poland, Lithuania, and Rus'. Thanks to Strykowski's work, Sarmatism acquired its unique shape in Lithuania. His *Chronicle* introduced not only the idea of Sarmatia but also the legend of Palemon to the boyar class at large. The links that Strykowski made between the Roman-origin theory and the Sarmatian-origin theory helped to bring the legend of Palemon closer to the Ruthenians. By joining the origins and fates of Lithuanians, Poles, and Ruthenians into one, Strykowski elevated the independent past of the Lithuanian nation and avoided more powerful attitudes in pan-Slavism and Polonocentrism, which were characteristic of Polish Sarmatism. Strykowski's notion of Sarmatism did not negate a Lithuanian identity; instead, the Sarmatism of his *Chronicle* was Lithuanianized and aligned with the Lithuanian

49 Jučas, *Lietuvos metraščiai ir kronikos*, pp. 168–169.

50 This quote is based on the Lithuanian translation of parts of Stryjkowski's *Chronicle* that can be found in: E. Patiejūnienė, "Trys Motiejaus Strijkovskio Kronikos vertimo ištraukos," in *Literatūra ir Lietuvos modernėjimo procesai XV–XVIII a.*, vol. 33 of *Senoji Lietuvos literatūra*, ed. Mintautas Čiurinskas (Vilnius: Mokslo ir enciklopedijų leidykla, 2012), 244.

state ideology. In this manner, Strykowski attempted to lay foundations for the entrenchment of Sarmatism in Lithuania as an ideology that, while freestanding, did not stand in opposition to that of the state.[51]

Bömelburg sees the Strykowski-Guagnini concept as a hybrid construction of new visions of history, fusing the humanistic national history of Poland with information about events in Lithuanian and Rus′ history. In writing these two parallel historical narratives of Poland and Lithuania, respectively, however, the author of these texts strove to not highlight the more controversial viewpoints associated with it. This position dovetailed with the interests of the GDL's elite, which supported the idea of the Polish-Lithuanian union. Still, Bömelburg notes with emphasis that Lithuania's political elite had a strong Lithuanian identity and favored the union for political reasons without surrendering the traditions of Lithuanian independence. This is why, whenever a conflict arose, Lithuania's political nation could lean exclusively on the Lithuanian view of history.[52]

I have discussed just a few of the ways the Palemon legend was received that are important in terms of political culture. Research to date shows that the theory of the Lithuanians' Roman origins, appearing in the sixteenth century, became a story that was used to describe many of Lithuania's social phenomena and propose a reasoning for the goal of political independence. The legend of Palemon became an important factor in consolidating an ethnically diverse society. Its reception reached the political society in various ways and found various forms of expression in the political culture. By the turn of the seventeenth century, the Roman origins story had begun to coexist with the theory of Sarmatism in its Lithuanian political culture. It is thought that among regular boyars, especially those in the Rus′ lands that were part of Lithuania, Sarmatism began to both compete and coexist with Palemonism through the use of Polish, which was more widely known than Latin. At the beginning of the early modern period, both ethnopolitical stories became part of the GDL's political culture.

---

51 For more on the Lithuanian understanding of Sarmatism, see "Sarmatyzm a piśmienictwo barokowe Wielkiego Księstwa Litewskiego," in *Barok. Historia—Literatura—Sztuka*, ed. Juliusz A. Chróścicki, vol. 3, book 2 (Warsaw: Neriton, 1996), 141–153.

52 Bömelburg, *Polska myśl historyczna*, 590–594. This opus also includes a work still discussed by researchers today: "Sarmatia Europae dscriptio" by Alessandro Guagnini (Aleksander Gwagnini), published in 1578 and popular around Europe. Stryjkowski called it a plagiarized version of his *Chronicle*.

The makeup and manifestation of a political culture have two origins. One is the time and environment of the culture's founders and nurturers. I elaborated on these aspects in Part 1 of this book. The other, a contrasting origin, belongs to the sphere of the culture. From the standpoint of universal culture, the GDL's political culture was formed by the Renaissance between the second half of the fifteenth century to the first half of the seventeenth century. Researchers, however, are increasingly debating the term "Renaissance" and have begun to question its heretofore undisputed nature.[1] I do not wish to plunge into this specialized theoretical discussion. Instead, I will use the concept "Renaissance" as a metaphor in its most recognizable form, denoting the cultural period under discussion.

The spread of Renaissance culture in Lithuania began in the late fifteenth century and continued until the middle of the seventeenth.[2] Experts on ancient Lithuanian literature, the texts of which I will often use in speaking about political culture, observe Renaissance manifestations in Lithuania at the beginning of the sixteenth century and date the solid entrenchment of the phenomenon to the middle of that century. The end of this period, in the second half of the sixteenth century, is associated with several important events that formed the contours of another epoch, the Baroque.[3]

This new culture came to Lithuania later than it did in the lands of Western Europe. Its new ideas, however, quickly gained traction and began to form the basis of a new humanistic Renaissance culture. The courts of the rulers

---

1 Quentin Skinner describes the situation as follows: "One is simply that the term is too vague to be of much use. A second doubt has stemmed from the post-modern critique of meta-narratives and the teleological forms of historical writing to which they give rise. But the most widespread suspicion has arisen from the fact that the metaphor embodied in speaking of the Renaissance—the fact that the metaphor of revival and more specifically of rebirth— is so clearly an honorific one. The difficulty here is that, as soon as we reflect on the contours of early-modern European history, it becomes embarrassingly obvious that a majority of the population would have been surprised to learn about a rebirth or a recovery of anything that added any value to their lives. The most prevalent objection to employing the terms is thus that it marginalises and devalues those for whom the Renaissance never happened.... These are serious objections, but there is no escaping the fact that, in the period covered by the chapters that follow, there was *something* that, for *some* people, was undoubtedly reborn and restored." Q. Skinner, *Visions of Politics*, vol. 2: *Renaissance Virtues* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002), 1.

2 For a description of the Renaissance in Lithuania, see Romanas Plečkaitis, *Lietuvos filosofijos istorija*, vol. 1: *Viduramžiai—Renesansas—Naujieji amžiai* (Vilnius: Kultūros, filosofijos ir meno institutas, 2004), 58–92 (section 3: *Renesansinis humanizmas*).

3 *Senosios Lietuvos literatūra 1253–1795*, comp. Sigitas Narbutas (Vilnius: Lietuvių literatūros ir tautosakos institutas, 2011), 67.

Alexander, Sigismund the Old, and Sigismund Augustus, as well as those of the magnates along with the chancellery of the Lithuanian grand dukes, became hearths of Renaissance culture in Vilnius. The number of Lithuanians who enrolled in Western universities grew markedly in the sixteenth century. What Lithuania obtained from these universities and academies were ideas about connecting science with the needs of the state and society and new values and ways of manifesting them, all of which beginning to form a political culture.

On the scale of social values, Renaissance thinkers and politicians elevated public life above the private sphere. They understood public life as a space where values (*virtus*) were fostered and demonstrated and active participation in the work of state institutions as an opportunity to create values. They saw politics as the most important place for personal activity and rhetoric as the dominant form of expression in this sphere—an integral part of politics and a method of implementing policy. Politically minded Renaissance intellectuals based their ideals first and foremost on Cicero, the so-called godfather of political rhetoric, and on the most famous political rhetorical virtuoso of the Renaissance, Nicolo Machiavelli, a promoter of Renaissance ideas who demonstrated the advantages of this new way of speaking on political issues.[4]

These personal and social values of the Renaissance period had the greatest impact on the political culture of the GDL during the time under discussion. Rhetoric became firmly entrenched in the Renaissance literature of Lithuania, first and foremost in works of political publicistic bent. For writers, historians, and diplomats, rhetoric became a tool with which to express humanistic and personal values as well as patriotism toward the Grand Duchy of Lithuania. Authors imported scores of important historical examples from antiquity as lessons for the present. What is more, they found such examples in the Grand Duchy of Lithuania. For the intellectuals of Lithuanian at the time, one's existence in this world meant focusing life and work on the betterment of nation and state. Literature produced for various events and celebrations glorified the Lithuanian grand dukes and magnates for what they had done for their homeland.

Research on political cultures of bygone epochs is exceptional in its vivid use of scientific interpretation because no source on such cultures can demonstrative definitively that it is the smoking gun with which the researcher has corralled the truth. Historians go about their work by applying intuition to the

---

4 Victoria Ann Kahn, *Machiavellian Rhetoric. From the Counter-Reformation to Milton* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1994).

information in their possession to find and select sources of different kinds, analyze them, and draw a picture of the political culture. The criteria for the selection and reading of these sources, and the subtleties of interpreting them, depend on several factors. This is why research on political culture comes with an unavoidable element of subjectivity. Furthermore, a political culture itself is the impalpable work of politically minded people. Its makeup and its selection of methods and forms of expression are determined largely by the needs of a political community during a specific period. In this study, the community his the GDL's political nation and the period spans the second half of the fifteenth century to the first half of the seventeenth.

Studying the makeup of the GDL's political culture in the early modern period, one sees how free and politically active individuals of a new kind of arose and how their relationship with the political community, state, government, law and institutions changed within the national society. Thus we may observe the development of personal and political values, the forming of a hierarchy in the political nation's mentality, and the ability of those in the hierarchy to express these values publicly. By investigating the makeup of this political culture, I explain how the state identity of the GDL came about and understand the true meaning of the expressions *My, Litwa* (We, Lithuania) and *My, naród Litewski* (We, the Lithuanian nation) in sixteenth-century sources, that is, references to the members of the political nation.[5] In this manner I can elucidate the relationship of the Lithuanian identity of the state with its national identities and seek answers to the complex question that surrounds the change of identities in the Commonwealth of the Two Nations.[6]

To attain this goal, below I present several scenarios that represent the formation of the GDL's political culture and its makeup during the early modern period.

---

5 The phrase *My, naród Litewski* may be construed in two ways—"We, the Lithuanian nation" or "We, the nation of Lithuanians." I choose the first version in this study, given the multiethnicity of the country's sixteenth-century political nation.

6 Mathias Niendorf and Ingė Lukšaitė examine these issues from a theoretical perspective. See M. Niendorf, *Das Großfürstentum Litauen. Studien zur Nationsbildung in der Frühen Neuzeit (1569–1795)* (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag, 2006), and I. Lukšaitė, "Liublino unija ir identitetų kaitos Lietuvos Didžiojoje Kunigaikštystėje XVI a. antroje pusėje" / "Unia lubelska a zmiany tożsamości w Wielkim Księstwie Litewskim w drugiej połowie XVI wieku," in *Liublino unija: idėja ir jos tęstinumas / Unia lubelska: idea i jej kontynuacja*, ed. Liudas Glemža and and Ramunė Šmigelskytė-Stukienė (Vilnius: Nacionalinis muziejus Lietuvos Didžiosios Kunigaikštystės valdovų rūmai, 2011), 216–232 and 233–252.

1

Union—The Idea and Reality of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania's Political Culture

The history of unions between Poland and Lithuania began in 1386, when Lithuania Grand Duke Jogaila of the Gediminid dynasty was baptized and married Jadwyga, daughter of King Louis I of Poland and an offspring of the Anjou dynasty. Marriage opened the door for the newly baptized Catholic Jogaila and his Lithuanian dynasty to the Polish throne. From 1386 to 1572, the kings of Poland were chosen from the Gediminid dynasty, which after Jogaila's rule began to be called the Jagiellonian dynasty. The last union treaty between Poland and the Grand Duchy, the 1569 Union of Lublin, was executed by Sigismund Augustus, the last in the male line of the Gediminid (Jagiellonian) dynasty that ruled both states, and the Sejms of Poland and Lithuania. The resulting hereditary monarchy—the Commonwealth of the Two Nations—was comprised of two states, the Kingdom of Poland and the Grand Duchy of Lithuania.

The list of historiographical works that examine and discuss various aspects of the history of these unions is voluminous and continually growing.[1] Least examined, however, is the process that bound these two states and two political nations together from the perspective of the GDL's political culture. This is rather surprising, given that the societies of these two states cohabited under union terms for 409 years (sixteen or seventeen generations). The political societies of Lithuania and Poland changed markedly during that time, as did their attitudes toward and their interpretations and assessments of the union. This is why, in attempting to shed light on the makeup and manifestation of the GDL's political culture, one needs to discuss the attitude of the Duchy's political nation toward the union.

---

1 The most recent study on the unions between Poland and Lithuania is Frost, *The Oxford History of Poland-Lithuania.*

The founders of this dynastic union in 1386 were the Gediminids, who ruled Lithuania, and a group of politicians of Lesser Poland who represented the Kingdom of Poland after the death of King Louis of Poland.[2] One cannot speak of active participation and an independent position of the political community of Lithuanian boyars in the creation of the first union. This was the political project of the Gediminid dynasty. It is thought that members of the magnate class did participate along with the dukes as witnesses to the ratification of the agreement. Their votes, however, were not binding but advisory.

Just the same, the entire boyar society of the GDL, baptized into the Catholic Church, felt the outcome of the dynastic union that had been forged. Jogaila's privilege of 1387 granted Catholic boyars the right to participate in discussing, preparing, and making political decisions together with the Lithuanian grand dukes and the dynasty. Thus conditions were created during the Late Middle Ages for the founding of the future political nation and its culture.[3]

Written sources first attest to active participation of Lithuanian-magnate and Catholic-boyar representatives in the process of forming the union at the summit in Horodło in 1413. With the participation of King of Poland and the "Greatest Duke" (*supremus dux*) of Lithuania, Jogaila; the Lithuanian Grand Duke (*magnus dux*) Vytautas; and magnates and boyar representatives of both states, the interrelations of two states (the Kingdom of Poland and the Grand Duchy of Lithuania) and two political communities (the boyars of these two states) were consecrated in the legal language of the Late Middle Ages. This set the tone for relations during Jogaila's and Vytautas's reign and for posterity. The acts of the Horodło agreement deal with the apportionment of governmental power between the Gediminid rulers Jogaila and Vytautas, the status of the political communities of Poland and Lithuania, the order of participation in the life of the state and society and relations between them, and guidelines for reforms concerning the internal structure of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania. Concurrently, the agreements concluded in Horodło in 1413 laid the foundations for discussions concerning the concept of a Polish-Lithuanian union in the long term. As the political life of the Horodło agreements began,[4] the

---

2 See *1385 m. rugpjūčio 14 d. Krėvos aktas,* comp. Jūratė Kiaupienė, ed. Rūta Čapaitė, Jūratė Kiaupienė, S. C. Rowell, Edmundas Rimša, and Eugenija Ulčinaitė (Vilnius: Žara, 2002).

3 See the chapter "A Sociopolitical and Sociocultural Portrait of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania" in this book.

4 For the agreements executed in the 1413 Treaty of Horodło along with historical studies and a comprehensive bibliography, see *1413 metų Horodlės aktai (Dokumentai ir tyrinėjimai) / Akty*

union became an important long-term contributor to the formation of the GDL's political culture.

Politicians of the time began to use the Horodło documents directly after they were issued. The broadest discussions that arose in the public political sphere concerned how to understand and assess the rhetoric[5] attached to Jogaila' and Vytautas's joint act. These debates were an inseparable part of the GDL's political culture; they shaped the values and principles of the political community and helped to develop and foster their view toward the Lithuanian state.

The first serious test of the union's robustness came to a head when the idea arose to crown Vytautas as king of Lithuania.[6] As the question of whether this move would violate the Polish-Lithuanian agreements of 1413 was being mulled, the interpretation of the contents of Horodło documents turned into a public political debate. Polish politicians demanded the heeding of the section in Jogaila and Vytautas's document concerning the incorporation of the GDL into the Kingdom of Poland. Lithuania challenged this article and strove for a new agreement that would consecrate the union as comprised of two equal states/partners. The resulting conflict between Poland and Lithuania may therefore be seen as a clash over the interpretation of the 1413 Treaty of Horodło. The Polish side demanded strict adherence to the letter of the law. The Lithuanians sought to revise the agreements, knowing full well that if Lithuania were to become a kingdom, it would abrogate the clauses of the act that established Lithuanian dependence on the Kingdom of Poland.[7]

Tense verbal jousting over the word "incorporation," as used in the 1413 act of Jogaila and Vytautas, continued even after Vytautas's death. During this period, one can observe the active involvement of Lithuanian magnates, and of the boyars who supported them, in discussions of the problems of the union.

---

horodelskie z 1413 roku (Dokumenty i studia), ed. Jūratė Kiaupienė, Lidia Korczak, Piotr Rabiej, Edmundas Rimša, and Jan Wroniszewski (Vilnius: Lietuvos istorijos instituto leidykla, 2013).

5 The most recent published version of the original act is "Actum principum, Regis Poloniae atque Supremi Ducis Lithuaniae Vladislai Jogaila et magni Ducis Lithuaniae Alexandri Vytautas," ed. Lidia Korczak, in *1413 m. Horodlės aktai,* 37–42.

6 Relative to the earlier contribution of historiography to this issue, this problem has been examined in depth in recent years. See J. Nikodem, "Zbigniew Oleśnicki wobec unii polsko-litewskiej do śmierci Jagiełły," *Nasza przeszłość. Studia z dziejów Kościoła i kultury katolickiej w Polsce* 91 (1999), 142–149, and G. Błaszczyk, *Dzieje stosunków polsko-litewskich,* vol. 2: *Od Krewa do Lublina,* part 1 (Poznań: Wydawnictwo Poznańskie, 2007), 505–588.

7 Błaszczyk, *Dzieje stosunków polsko-litewskich,* 580.

Nevertheless, numerous difficulties arose. Lithuania's Grand Duke Švitrigaila (r. 1430–1432) and the political elite that had nominated him for the throne unilaterally, without Poland's consent , did not recognize the concept of incorporation and maintained steadily that the Grand Duchy of Lithuania was a sovereign state and that its political community had the right to participate in deciding its fate. Concurrently, the politicians of Poland continued to emphasize the acts that validated the agreements of Jogaila and Vytautas as arguments that were not easy to refute in legal terms.[8]

These and other irreconcilable differences marked the first half of Casimir's rule. When news came that King of Poland Władysław III of Varna had died in a battle near Varna, politicians from Poland launched negotiations with his brother, Lithuanian Grand Duke Casimir, for the assumption of the Polish throne. It is known that in 1446, Lithuania offered Poland a project meant to yield a new agreement that would lay out future conditions for their relations. One of its articles foresaw the abolishing of the old acts of union, which treated to incorporation as something inconsistent with the interests of the Lithuanian state. In the case at hand, no agreement was concluded. However, some of the principal terms enunciated by the high-ranking state officials who represented the GDL in those negotiations were maintained by political community even after Lithuanian Grand Duke Casimir was crowned King of Poland in 1447. The process of political unification marched ahead.

As the Middle Ages came to a close and the unification concept progressed and took on a more modern form, however, the situation changed. The medieval hereditary dynasties and personal unions that existed in various regions from Spain to Scandinavia fell apart or changed shape in the early modern period. As national monarchies began to form, there was a growing tendency to distinguish the political body from the coalescence of a state defined by borders. Nevertheless, the problem of coexistence among states and the dynasties that ruled them had to be solved. A way was found: dynasties and states could enter into a union agreement and create a composite of independent states. Although the appearance of each union act was greatly influenced by specific circumstances, these complex political bodies had commonalities that were typical of their eras. At the beginning of the early modern period, one can see ever more clearly, alongside the dynasties, the position of class-representing institutions (parliaments) and full-fledged participants in the life

---

8 Nikodem, "Zbigniew Oleśnicki," 148–149.

of the state, who had gathered into political nations. The Polish-Lithuanian union experienced this transformation as well.

At the Polish-Lithuanian meeting in Lublin in 1448, held to resolve the disagreement between Poland and Lithuania concerning the union, the political elites of the two states, Poland and Lithuania, ruled by one leader, Casimir, again addressed their mutual relations. High-ranking Lithuanian state officials, most famously Jonas Goštautas, Palatine of Vilnius, once more tried to convince their Polish counterparts that the old agreement between the states did harm to Lithuania and assured them that, if they wished to restore the bilateral relationship to harmony, the words about the incorporation of the GDL into the Kingdom of Poland must be expunged from the documents pertaining to the old agreement. The Polish envoys refused on legal grounds, adding that all claims would disappear once both countries would be understood as one body—the Kingdom of Poland, the name of the Grand Duchy of Lithuanian being abolished. No accord was concluded in 1448.[9]

The dispute continued when politicians from Poland and Lithuania gathered in Parczew in 1451. Speaking for Lithuania, Bishop Matthias of Vilnius repeated his precedessors' demand: all words in the old agreement that were offensive to Lithuanians and that referred to the joining of Lithuania and the Lithuanian-governed Rus´ districts to the Kingdom of Poland must be deleted. That is, part of the 1413 act between Jogaila and Vytautas must be abrogated. Mattias spoke on behalf of the GDL delegation claimed that their countrymen had ratified the old acts under the pressure of the Grand Duke and had not understood well what was written in them. Bishop Zbigniew Oleśnicki, representing Poland, balked at this as had his predecessors: it was not possible, he asserted, to revise documents that had been issued by such wise dukes as Jogaila and Vytautas and ratified by high-ranking Lithuanian clergy and magnates.

In 1452, Lithuanian politicians repeated their demand, to no avail. When the representatives of the two political communities gathered the next year, a conflict broke out between them about heraldry. To this day, historians debate whether the Lithuanian boyars, protesting the Polish side's political pressure at the meeting, surrendered the Polish boyars' coats of arms received at Horodło in 1413.[10] Assessing this clash from the perspective of

---

9 Nikodem, "Zbigniew Oleśnicki," 119–120; Błaszczyk, *Dzieje stosunków polsko-litewskich*, 818–822.

10 For a comprehensive history of the awarding of Polish family coats of arms to Lithuanian boyars, see J. Wroniszewski, "Pieczęcie polskie przy dokumentach horodelskich w świetle

political culture, one sees clearly that the fifteenth-century Polish coats of arms did not play the unifying role for the two political nations that the initiators of the Horodło acts had hoped for—a hope that had become even fainter in view of the changes that the society of the GDL had undergone by the middle of that century.

A privilege issued by Lithuanian Grand Duke Sigismund in 1434 repealed some of the provisions invoked in the Horodło acts of 1413, which limited the political rights of Orthodox believers. One of the abrogated clauses was the requirement that only Catholics or those holding Polish coats of arms take up high public duties or join the council of the Lithuanian Grand Duke. It took until 1563, however, for de jure equality between Orthodox believers and Catholics to be fully established. It was then that the ruler Sigismund Augustus, with the endorsement of the Council of Lords, made Catholics and Orthodox believers equal under law in the GDL, with no further reference to the superiority of Polish coats of arms. In fact, in the opinion of the heraldry expert Edmundas Rimša, Polish coats of arms never enjoyed superiority in Lithuania. Even during the first decades after the Horodło agreements, the seals of high-standing nobles in the local Lithuanian and the Polish heraldry, received through adoption, were posted next to one another when important acts and agreements of state were stamped. The dukes' symbols of local origin always had priority and their seals always dangled respectfully in front of the list of witnesses.

A closer look today at the Lithuanian heraldry of the nobility would show that it is composed of at least four strata. Some coats of arms appeared in Lithuania. These are the most important to Lithuanian heraldic heritage. Polish coats of arms, appearing after the Horodło Union went into effect in 1413, comprise another large stratum. It consists of some fifty families who accepted coats of arms such as belong to noble Polish families (*szlachta*). A third, smaller stratum comprises the coats of arms brought in from other countries. Generally, the persons owning these had acquired Lithuanian citizenship for their military service or other merits and settled in Lithuania. The fourth is a small stratum of Muslim Tatar families and their specific heraldry.

Other minorities, such as the Karaite Jewish groups, lived in Lithiania for ages. There is no reliable data data as of yet on Karaite heraldry. The Jewish community generally displayed the hexagonal Star of David on its heraldic

---

polskiej średniowiecznej sfragistyki / Lenkiški antspaudai prie Horodlės dokumentų Lenkijos Viduramžių sfragistikos šviesoje," in *1413 metų Horodlės aktai,* 145–172; E. Rimša, "Horodlės aktai ir Lietuvos kilmingųjų heraldika / Akta horodelskie a heraldyka litewskich bojarów," in *1413 metų Horodlės aktai,* 173–254.

seals. Those who converted to Christianity often received a title—that of a boyar. Such persons took a coat of arms befitting the new noble rank.

Quite early on, most likely, in the thirteenth century, Lithuania "became acquainted" with European heraldry. However, more opportunities for engaging in peaceful relatioships with other countries only opened after the official christening of Lithuania in 1387 and the victory at the Battle of Žalgiris (Grünwald) in 1410. Meanwhile, the society of Lithuania has also changed over the two centuries. Conditions ripened for adopting and adapting many new legal and moral standarts and cultural matters of the European nobility, including their intricately devised coats of arms.

Certainly, it cannot be said that there weren't symbols of denotation in Lithuania prior to that time. Nonetheless, the only denotation that can be considered heraldic must be inherited, have colors, and at the least, appear on a coat of arms or a shield. These were not characteristic of most denotations used in Lithiania to the end of the fourteenth century. Because of this, certain authors defined the old Lithuanian denotation marks as property brands and entirely rejected potential consideration of such symbols as the heraldry until the late fourteenth century. However, they admitted that such symbols could have been the predecessors of many Lithuanian coats of arms.

According to the available data, it can be said that the first coats of arms of Lithuanian nobility appeared during the last decades of the fourteenth century; in other words, even prior to the Horodło Act. It is even unlikely that the arms at Horodło would be remembered if the soil had not been ploughed for this phenomenon to disseminate into public view. One Lithuanian chronicler wrote that during the 1451 Parczew Sejm, due to disagreements, part of the Lithuanian nobility refused the coats of arms they received from Poles at Horodło, and reverted to using their old ones. Althouth this information came later and historians never throughly examined it, part of the truth cearly lies underneath. The Horodło Act brought two consequences to the heraldry of Lithuania overall. First, it opened the way for the dissemination of Polish coats of arms and Polish culture. Secondly, it indisputably speeded up the already ongoing process of making the denotations of the area heraldic. The majority of coats of arms that appeared locally, most of which contain linear charges, predominated until the latter half of the sixteenth century. Later, some of them were polonized and others replaced with Polish coats of arms.[11] Moreover, the Horodło coats of arms were limited to a small number of families. These were not

11   Edmundas Rimša, *Heraldry past to present*, trans. Vijolė Arbas (Vilnius: Versus aureus, 2005).

"the most important lords of Lithuania", as was customarily claimed in the literature since Jan Długosz, but the people close to Grand Duke Vytautas. They were represented in Horodło by the highest state officials of this time, as well as by those who were in the service of the Duke, but not in the higher offices. Some of the names are known only from acts of Horodło. Thus, the fifty families represented all layers of the nobility.[12]

The heraldic tradition of the Lithuanian state from the fourteenth century onwards saw many changes, renovations, and revisions, attesting to its significance in expressing the country's political culture.

The Horodło acts of 1413 were again mentioned at the turn of the fifteenth century. After the death of Casimir, King of Poland and Grand Duke of Lithuania, in 1492, two separate rulers were chosen: Lithuanian Grand Duke Alexander and Polish King John (I) Albert (Iohannes Albertus). In 1493, the political echelons of the two states launched discussions for the renewal and rewording of the Polish-Lithuanian union. High-ranking Lithuanian state officials were not alone in carrying out this process; boyars who represented the political community were there as well. Thus a new page in the life of the political culture of the Horodło acts was turned.

In a document of January 9, 1499, Lithuanian Grand Duke Alexander vested the power to execute a new union with Poland in representatives of the GDL—the Samogitian Bishop Martin Lintfari and Jan Zaberezhynsky, Palatine of Trakai. High-ranking Lithuanian officials who had gathered in Grodno were witnesss to Alexander's document.[13] Several documents that regulated relations between Poland and Lithuania were drafted with the participation of representatives of both countries in 1499. It was stated in these instruments that the old bilateral agreements were affirmed and that the acts of Polish boyars[14] and Lithuanian boyars,[15] executed in Horodło in 1413, were recorded in the new agreement. The countries undertook to inform one another when choosing a new leader and to invite each another to participate

---

12 See *1413 metų Horodlės aktai*, 531–543.

13 "Aleksander wielki książę litewski daje Marcinowi biskupowi żmudzkiemu i Janowi Zabrzezińskiemu kasztelanowi i wojewodzie trockiemu oraz marszałkowi litewskiemu pełnomocnictwo do zawarcia unji z Koroną," Grodno, January 9, 1499, in *Akta unji Polski z Litwą, 1385–1791*, 119–120. The source includes a list of names of GDL representatives who adopted the document.

14 "Actum baronum et nobilium Regni Poloniae," ed. Lidia Korczak, in *1413 metų Horodlės aktai*, 19–21.

15 Ibid., 29–31.

in the elections. Polish King John (I) Albert,[16] the Polish Council of Lords,[17] and Lithuania's Council of Lords[18] ratified the new accord. The roster of officials who participated in discussing, preparing, and adopting these documents show how the situation of the GDL's political nation had changed. Among the participants were both magnates and Catholic boyars from Lithuania's core lands and Orthodox officials representing those Rus' territories which were under Lithuanian domain at that time.

This unity among the states and their partners, however, was short-lived; the negotiations in 1499 did not lead to the reshaping of intra-union relations. The events that followed the death of Polish King John (I) Albert in 1501 demonstrate this. On August 27 of that year, in Grodno, Grand Duke Alexander appointed five envoys—high-ranking Lithuanian state officials, confirmed by Lithuania's Council of Lords—and authorized them to participate in the elections for the Polish king and to carry out negotiations, if any, for a union with Poland.[19] Lithuanian Grand Duke Alexander was chosen King of Poland by an electoral sejm in August 1501 in Piotrków, Poland. Again both countries were ruled by one and the same representative of the Jagiellonian dynasty, who had an interest in binding them into a strong union. His aim in this respect dovetailed with the interests of Poland's political elite. The Piotrkow Sejm renewed union negotiations with Alexander's deputies from the Lithuanian Sejm. The main principles for the new union were set forth in a document drawn up by the Council of Lords of the Kingdom of Poland.[20] The most important article of this instrument in the political sense declares the Kingdom of Poland and

---

16 "Jan Olbracht król polski zatwierdza układ, zawarty między Litwą i Koroną przez rady polskie i pełnomocników litewskich," Kraków, May 6, 1499, *Akta unji*, no. 74, 123–124.

17 "Panowie rady polskie oświadczają, że gdy do dokumentu, wystawionego pełnomocnikom litewskim, nie mogli wcielić dokumentu przodków swoich, gdyż go nie było pod ręką, wydadzą na żądannie Litwy nowy dokument z wcielonym awnym, pod tążsamą, co poprzedni, datą," Kraków, May 14, 1499, *Akta unji*, no. 75, 124–125.

18 "Panowie rady litewskie, zatwierdzają układ z Koroną, transsumują dokument, wydany 2 pażdziernika 1413 przez bojarów litewskich w Horodle," Wilno, July 24, 1499, *Akta unji*, no. 76, 126–130.

19 "Aleksander wielki książę litewski daje pełnomocnictwo pięciu posłom swoim do udziału w elekcji króla polskiego i do ewentualnych pertraktacyj o unję z Polską," Grodno, August 27, 1501, *Akta unji*, no. 77, 130–131; "Panowie rady litewskiej dają pięciu posłom wielkiego księcia Aleksandra pełnomocnictwo do udziału w elekcji króla polskiego i do ewentualnych pertraktacyj o unję z Polską," Bielsk, September 9, 1501, *Akta unji*, no. 78, 131–134.

20 "Panowie rady polskie odnawiają umowy w sprawie unji z posłami Aleksandra wielkiego księcia litewskiego i sejmu litewskiego," Piotrków na sejmie, October 3, 1501, *Akta unji*, no. 79, 134–138.

the Grand Duchy of Lithuania joined together in one state and social body (organism) and ruled by one king.[21] The five envoys of Grand Duke Alexander and the Lithuanian Sejm adopted by consensus a document of the same content that established a new union,[22] as is known from a copy of their oath.[23] These sources allow us to say that five envoys of the GDL Sejm, who participated in Poland's electoral Sejm agreed to a new union in 1501. Was this the position of the entire Sejm, which represented the political nation? To understand the attitude of Lithuania's political nation toward the new union, let us take a look at the ensuing events that were connected with its implementation in practical terms.

Lithuanian Grand Duke Alexander adopted the unification agreement with a document issued in Mielnik on October 23, 1501, known in historiography as the Act or Union of Mielnik.[24] He announced this in Lithuania before he assumed the crown of Poland on December 12 of that year. We know the names of the representatives of the GDL's political nation who adopted the union from another document issued by Alexander, this one on October 30, 1501.[25] Absent on the list of names are high-ranking Lithuanian state officials

---

21 "1. Primum, quod regnum Poloniae et magnus ducatus Lithwaniae uniantur et conglutinentur in unum et indivisum ac indifferens corpus, ut sit una gens, unus populus, una fraternitas et communia consilia eidemque corpori perpetuo unum caput, unus rex unusque dominus in loco et tempore assignatis per praesentes et ad electionem convenientes votis communibus eligatur quodque absentium obstantia electio non impediatur et decretum electionis in regno semper sit iuxta consuetudines circa illud ex antiquo servatas." See "Panowie rady polskie odnawiają umowy w sprawie unji z posłami Aleksandra wielkiego księcia litewskiego i sejmu litewskiego," Piotrków na sejmie, October 3, 1501, *Akta unji*, no. 79, 137.

22 "Posłowie Aleksandra wielkiego księcia litewskiego i sejmu litewskiego odnawiają umowy w sprawie unji z panami rady koronnymi," Piotrków na sejmie, October 3, 1501, *Akta unji*, no. 80, 138–142.

23 The original text of the oath has not been found. A copy is kept in the Crown Metrica of Poland: "Rota przysięgi składanej przez posłów litewskich, iż umowa o unję przez nich zostanie potwierdzona," Piotrków na sejmie, October 3, 1501, *Akta unji*, no. 81, 142.

24 "Aleksander wielki książę litewski zatwierdza umowę w sprawie unji, zawartą między posłami jego i sejmu litewskiego a panami radų koronnymi," Mielnik, October 23, 1501, *Akta unji*, no. 82, 142–147; *Volumina constitutionum*, part 1: *1493–1549*, vol. 1: *1493–1526*, ed. Stanisław Grodziski, Irena Dwornicka, and Wacław Uruszczak (Warsaw: Wydawnictwo Sejmowe, 1996), 102–109.

25 "Alexander Dei gratia electus rex regni Poloniae, magnus dux Lythvaniae, Samagithiae, Russiae, Kyoviae etc. dominus et haeres. Significamus tenore praesentium quibus expedit universis, praesentium notitiam habituris, quomodo venientes ad nostri praesentiam magnifici, strenui, generosi et nobiles Georgius Paczowycz, dux Johannes Glinski marschalcus curiae nostrae, tenutarius in Maiori Merecz et in Vczana, Johannes Mikolayowycz marschalcus noster et tenutarius Vilkiensis, Georgius Hylynicz marschalcus noster et tenutarius Lydensis, Stanislaus

such as bishops, palatines, and the chancellor. Most of those recorded came from the Vilnius royal court and had served the Grand Duke. Alexander and his representatives were unable to convince the Lithuanian Sejm to adopt the 1501 Mielnik Union. The process of renewing the union ground to a halt.

The 1505 Radom Sejm was intended to be a general assembly, in which representatives of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania and Royal Prussia would take part. The GDL's Sejm was represented by a select coterie of senators in Radom: Jan Zaberezhynsky, Palatine of Trakai; Stanisław Janowicz, Castellan of Trakai and Starosta of Samogitian Duke Michael Gliński; Lithuanian Court Marshal and Great Hetman Stanisław Kiszka; Stanisław Hlebowicz, Palatine of Polotsk; and Mikołaj Kościelecki, Palatine of Brest. The idea of adjoining the Lithuanian state to Poland, however, was not discussed at the Radom Sejm in 1501. The Lithuanian delegation was not empowered to debate the 1501 union, which the GDL Sejm had not adopted. What is more, there were internal conflicts among the delegation members, several senators objecting to the union concept laid out in the Mielnik document. In addition, Alexander was unable to participate actively in the Radom Sejm for health reasons, as he became paralyzed during it. He died in Vilnius on August 19, 1506.[26]

Zabrzezenski marscalcus noster, Albertus Gastolthowycz, dux Georgius Alexandrowycz, Barthossius Thaborowycz marschalcus noster et tenutarius Moyschegoliensis, Alexander Choczkowycz tenutarius Puniensis, Johannes Zabrzezenski, Nicolaus Niemyerowycz, Georgius Niemierowycz, dux Johannes Leonis marschalcus et vexillifer magni ducatus Lythwaniae, Johannes alias Vasyl Bogdanowycz Chrepthowycz venator et tenutarius in Onikszthi, dux Vasil Leonis subdapifer et tenutarius in Vasilyszki, Martinus Bogdanowycz Chreptowycz magister equorum curiae nostrae, Pheczko Januszewycz notarius et tenutarius in Skyersthemunow, dux Vasil Polvbenski, dux Phedor Czethwertenski, dux Vasil Zilinski, NyemiraMyelniczensis, Johannes Steczko Drohyczensis capitanei, Venceslaus Kosczewycz, Georgius Dovoynowycz tenutarius Dolgostiensis, Georgius Kosczewycz, Andreas Dovoynowycz, Voyno claviger Brestensis, Ivachno Andreyowycz, Martinus Meleszkowycz, Petrus Fvrsowycz, Juchno Vorona et Voyna Fineleyewycz, dignitarii, officiales, duces, curienses, boiarones magni ducatus nostri Lythvaniae, promiserunt et iuraverunt omnia et singula, quae pro bono pacis, unionis et mutuae defensionis inclitorum dominiorum regni Poloniae et magni ducatus Lythvaniae per oratores et consiliarios nostros in conventione generali Pyotrcovyensi cum praelatis, baronibus, consiliariis, nobilibus proceribusque universis praefati regni Poloniae nostro ac universorum praelatorum, baronum, ducum, nobilium, procerum et communitatum magni ducatus nostri Lythvaniae nomininibus..." See "Aleksander wielki książę litewski, wybrany król polski, zaświadcza, iż dwudziestu siedmiu książąt, panów i szlachty W. Ks. Litewskiego przyrzekło dotrzymać unji, zawartej z Polską, i przyjęło na siebie zobowiązanie, iż uzna ją ogół litewskiej szlachty," Mielnik, October 30, 1501, *Akta unji*, no. 83, 147–149.

26 *Nihil novi. Z dorobku sejmu radomskiego 1505 roku*, vol. 1: *Wstęp historyczny*, by Andrzej Szymanek; vol. 2: *Materiały źródłowe*, transl. Henryk Wójtowicz (Radom: Stowarzyszenie Anno Domini, 2005).

Alexander's brother Sigismund the Old was chosen as the new King of Poland and Grand Duke of Lithuania. During his rule, the question of unification, while not forgotten, was not publicly discussed at meetings of politicians from the two countries for several decades into the sixteenth century. However, the political cultures of Poland and GDL differed from each other. From the Middle Ages these cultures have cherished various political and state values. Therefore, their traditions of remembering these events were also very different.

Sigismund the Old, like the others, did not raise the issue of unification publicly. Cautiously maneuvering between the political factions of Poland and Lithuania, he tried to keep domestic relations stable by skirting the controversy that surrounded the unification issue. Holding the twin thrones of Poland and the Grand Duchy of Lithuania, he was able to put both countries' potential to rather effective use in strengthening the Jagiellonian dynasty's position in Central Eastern Europe. His treatment of the unification question earned him the support of a majority of Lithuania's political nation and the trust of the Council of Lords. In 1522, the Vilnius Sejm affirmed the right of his young son, Sigismund Augustus, to succeed him as the Grand Duke of Lithuania upon his death. This action, not coordinated with the politicians of Poland, once again emphasized Lithuania's state sovereignty and the right of its political nation to determine the fate of its own state.

Another step in this direction was taken in 1526 when representatives of Lithuania's political elite revived Vytautas's idea of forming a Kingdom of Lithuania. In the name of the GDL's Council of Lords, Sigismund the Old was asked to assign this crown to his son, Sigismund Augustus.[27] The council's envoys—the ducal Bishop Jan of Vilnius (a son of Sigismund the Old, fathered out of wedlock) and Jan Radziwiłł, Castellan of Trakai and Starosta of Grodno—reminded Sigismund the Old that the Holy Father and Emperor of the Holy Roman Empire had sent Vytautas a royal crown in view of the significance of Grand Duke Vytautas's work, his firm stance against paganism, and the fame of the country he ruled, the Grand Duchy of Lithuania. Vytautas, however, died as the crown was being delivered to him; it was held back by Polish lords who did not wish to relinquish it, that is, to recognize the patrimonial state's

---

27 The text reads as follows: "Toe poselstvo pravili ot panov rad Velikogo Kniaz´stva kniaz´ Ian, biskup vilenskii, pan trotskii, starosta gorodenskii, pan Iuri Mikolaevich Radivilovicha v tot tsas, kak g(o)s(po)dar ego m(i)l(o)st´ byl u Varshave educhy so Gdan″ska etc." *Lietuvos Metrika, Užrašymų knyga 7 (1506–1539)*, ed. Inga Ilarienė, Laimontas Karalius, Darius Antanavičius (Vilnius: Lietuvos istorijos instituto leidykla, 2011), 597–602.

right to the honor. "This is why the Lithuanian Council and our brother [Like the Kingdom of Poland, GDL used the word 'brother' to show their respect for the political people] humbly ask Sigismund the Old to order the servants of the Polish Crown to return that crown, sent to the Grand Duchy of Lithuania, to the Grand Duke-elect Sigismund Augustus."

In this request, one can observe the rivalry that the Lithuanian Council of Lords felt with the Kingdom of Poland in its envoys' ideologically charged arguments. The Lithuanians accused the lords of Poland of retaining a crown that rightly belonged to Vytautas.[28] What matters most, however, is the Council's motive for wanting Sigismund Augustus to be crowned king. In the request, the lords aver with emphasis that if Sigismund the Old's patrimonial state, the Grand Duchy of Lithuania, should have a crown, it must not be appropriated by the Crown of Poland, because two crowns cannot be joined together. The Polish lords, then, should no longer seek the humiliation or subjugation of their patrimonial Lithuanian state. Once this is settled, the brotherhood and friendship of the Lithuanian and the Poles will allow both to stand together against any and all enemies.

Sigismund the Old was shown specific ways to secure a crown for a Lithuanian king:

> …If Their Graces, the lords of the council of the Polish Crown, do not want to return the crown for Your Grace's son to the Grand Duchy of Lithuania, then Their Graces the advisors of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania ask your Grace to provide envoys to send to the Holy Father and to the Emperor and await the Grand Duchy of Lithuania's crown for your son. And as for who should pay for this, the advisors of Their Graces out of their goodness would like to assume the expenses and not spurn them.[29]

This request does more than reveal the attitude of Lithuania's highest officials toward the state of the country and its future prospects. It shows that the goal of kingdom still nestled in the memory of Lithuania's political nation even a century after Vytautas's death. This is why I may speak of the state identity as

---

28 Today, historians have concluded that the accusations against the Poles, of having stolen Vytautas's crown, were unfounded. For more information see Rimvydas Petrauskas, "Valdovas ir jo karūna: neįvykusios Vytauto karūnacijos aplinkybės," *Lietuvos istorijos metraštis* 2 (2009): 57–72.

29 See "Toe poselstvo...," *Lietuvos Metrika, Užrašymų knyga 7 (1506–1539)*, 601

representative of the spirit of the epoch and the ability to demonstrate it publicly. The political project of a Lithuanian kingdom was not realized because Sigismund the Old, the ruler of both countries, did not support the idea. However, Lithuania's political elite used the idea of a kingdom in their future discussions over unification with Poland as an important argument, if not as proof, that Lithuania was a full-fledged state and must not become a province of Poland. Thus the kingdom idea became an important precipitant of unity among those who populated in Lithuania's political nation.

During the sixteenth century, this political nation not only retained memories of the clauses in the 1413 Treaty of Horodło that had offended its honor but also tried to "amend" the document. This is shown by an entry in the Lithuanian Metrica (a set of books kept in the archive of the GDL chancellery)[30] to the effect that the Lithuanian historian Darius Kuolys highlights to provide details of the "editing" of the treaty by Jogaila and Vytautas. Kuolys's account of this act, which has all the traits of a detective story, shows how the Lithuanians' attitude toward the 1413 Treaty of Horodło changed during the fifteenth century.[31]

Comparing the copy of the document produced by Jogaila and Vytautas with the original, Kuolys points out marked differences in the texts. Almost all content that violates the independence of the Lithuanian nation is "corrected" in the copy of the 1413 instrument that Jogaila and Vytautas possessed. In their copy, a clause is missing concerning the earlier incorporation and the impending reincorporation of King Władysław II's Lithuanian and Rus′ lands into the Kingdom of Poland. The concept of the "burden of slavery" that plagued the pre-state Lithuanians is greatly softened and the image of Jogaila and Vytautas gloriously lifting this burden from the nation's neck is gone. In the original treaty, it was stipulated that the Lithuanian boyars must stand alongside King Władysław II of Poland and Grand Duke Vytautas of Lithuania and their successors, the future Polish kings and Lithuanian grand dukes. The "editors" changed this markedly, deleting the duty towards "the Polish King and his successors" from the obligations incumbent on the Lithuanian boyars. Thus the boyars promised to be true only to Lithuanian Grand Duke Vytautas and his

---

30   "Sequuntur articuli ex privilegio Wladislai Iagielonis et Alexandri Withowdi dati in Hrodlo anno Domini MCCCC XIII," *Lietuvos Metrika, Užrašymų knyga 25 (1387–1546)*, ed. Darius Antanavičius and Algirdas Baliulis (Vilnius: Lietuvos istorijos instituto leidykla, 1998), no. 2.2, 44–46. 1413 m. See Supplement, nos. 1, 2.

31   Darius Kuolys, *Res Lituana Kunigaikštystės bendrija*, part 1: *Respublikos steigimas* (Vilnius: Lietuvių literatūros ir tautosakos institutas, 2009), 63–89.

descendants, the Lithuanian grand dukes. According to another section now deleted, upon Vytautas's death the Lithuanian boyars would no longer have the right to choose their ruler independently, that is, against the will of the Polish king and nation. Per the new iteration, "The nobles of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania, upon the death of a grand duke who has no children and legal successors, shall choose a grand duke in a free election that they wish to conduct."

Kuolys also notes that the original version of the Horodło treaty limited the freedoms and benefits conferred by the pact to Lithuanian boyars who accept Polish coats of arms and are Catholic. The "Lithuanianized" version extends these freedoms and benefits to "barons and nobles of Lithuanian lands whose nobility is inherited from their fathers." The provision that only Catholics ("subjects of the Holy Roman Church") may be chosen as palatines and castellans was retained. The clause relating to joint Sejms of Lithuanian and Polish boyars in Poland, Lublin, or Parczew was revised to state that "If the need for parliaments or general meetings arises," they would be convened in Vilnius or elsewhere if the circumstances so warranted.

The "Lithuanianized" rewriting of the 1413 act in Vilnius affirms a totally independent Lithuanian statehood endowed with a full-fledged political society that is neither subordinate to the Kingdom of Poland nor incorporated into a political union with the Poles. It has the fundamental rights of a free nation—it may freely choose its ruler and resolve its issues of state in parliamentary assemblies that convene in its capital. The religious and ethnic limits to membership in the political community, emphasized in the original act, are suppressed. Vytautas is credited with the role of founder of the free Lithuanian nation; Jogaila is left in the shadows. The most important role, however, is not Vytautas's because the free society of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania has arisen not due to the grace of its rulers but from its noble forefathers. Furthermore, Lithuania's ancient history (*antiqua*) is not the shameful one of slavery but the honorable period of the noble ancestors.

In the first half of the sixteenth century, the revised copy was kept in the GDL chancery. One of the most important privileges issued by Lithuanian rulers from the end of the fourteenth century to the beginning of the sixteenth, it was retained as an act of state-level importance. It was recognized as such in 1541, when it was included in the Lithuanian Metrica together with the original 1413 document and other privileges issued by rulers, and again in 1598, during the Commonwealth era, when this book of the Lithuanian Metrica was rewritten in the Lithuanian state chancellery. Who falsified the 1413 document? Kuolys traces the deed to Lithuanian magnates. The GDL chancellery,

under the Lithuanian chancellor's watch, also could have done it. Kuolys, however, believes that the "Lithuanianized" act was not falsified solely as a manifestation of the Lithuanians' will; it also reflected the political and legal reality of the times. Namely, the 1413 Treaty of Horodło lost its validity when Casimir was elected Grand Duke. The Horodło treaty documents of 1413, however, were so important that they could not simply be removed from the collection of primary acts that created the political community even though they sorely offended the pride of the nation; hence their "correction" was unavoidable.[32]

Today, Robert Frost has already provided us with new important insights that complement Kuolys's interpretation. Frost emphasizes that the Lithuanians were in a good position after the Moldavian debacle to reopen this issue, discussion of which had stalled in 1453. It was probably at this point that the Lithuanian chancery prepared a document that survives in vol. 25 (*Užrašymų knyga* or "Book of Inscriptions") in the Lithuanian Metryka, the chancery archive, which comprises copies of privileges issued by Lithuanian grand dukes and was compiled in 1541 on the orders of the queen, Bona Sforca. The document is a reworking of Horodło that removes all hints of subservience to the kingdom of Poland. While it is possible that it was prepared in the 1440s or 1450s, it is more likely, since Horodło was central to the discusions in 1496 and 1499, that it was drafted in connection with these discussions. It is higly revealing of Lithuanian concepts of union. Kuolys talks of it as a forgery, but it seems better to regard it as a genuine attempt, in the context of the 1490s discussions, to draft a version of Horodło that would be acceptable to the Lithuanian citizen body. It omits entirely the first clause of the joint document issued by Jagiełło and Vytautas, with its litany of incorporationist synonyms, and radically alters the clause allowing for the election of a grand duke, omitting all reference to only electing candidates put forward by the king of Poland, and of the need to consult with the Poles, baldly stating that the right to elect whomsoever they chose as their grand duke.[33]

In the first half of the sixteenth century, the political nations of both Poland and Lithuania developed and fostered new but again different visions of their future relations. They formulated and laid out two concepts that suited the spirit of the times in terms of the traits of early modern political thought. That of the Polish boyars' Executionist movement[34] envisioned the transformation

---

32 Ibid., 132.

33 Frost, *The Oxford History of Poland-Lithuania*, vol. 1 333–334.

34 *Egzekucja* (Latin: *executio*) was the name given to a program of wide-reaching state reforms formulated in the first half of the sixteenth century by the Polish *szlachta*, which they tried

of the union into a single and indivisible demos under the Crown of Poland. The boyars' opposition not only promoted the idea of incorporating the GDL into the Kingdom of Poland but also placed Sigismund Augustus, who ruled both states and whose position was vicarious, under direct pressure. It was further complicated by the flaring of war between Lithuania and Russia in 1558, evolving by 1562 into a new and long-lasting conflict over the eastern and southeastern lands of the GDL. What is more, the Treaty of Vilnius, signed on November 28, 1561, attached Livonia (except for the city of Riga) to the GDL on the basis of provincial laws. This meant that the Lithuanians had to defend not only the territory of their own state on the battlefield but also that of Livonia, and that Sigismund Augustus would have to mobilize an army of conscripted boyars and petition the Polish Sejm for military aid. At one point, these events forced Sigismund Augustus to spend lengthy periods of time living in Vilnius, causing growing dissatisfaction in Poland. The war stoked already existing internal social conflicts in Poland and the GDL and provoked new ones. It also affected the political culture as such and greatly influenced the choice of ways and shapes in which this culture was manifested.

The political aims of the Executionist movement worried the GDL's political nation. Lithuania's political nation understood well the need to maintain good relations with the Polish state. However, they strove for a union between equal and independent political bodies or states—the GDL and the Polish Kingdom. This aspiration was discussed wherever members of the political nation gathered— state officials' manor estates, Sejms and sejmiks, conscript army camps, embassies, and venues of judges and cultural figures—and ideas circulated intensively. The political nation's acquaintance with the political culture of the Renaissance strengthened its belief that the GDL should become a centralized state, ruled by a strong monarch and supported by a well-organized bureaucratic apparatus loyal to him. Support for the war with Muscovy over the Rus' lands of the GDL and for the economic and political integration of these territories was a part of the project that proposed to bring this centralized monarchy into being.

By the early 1560s, hopes that Sigismund Augustus would leave an heir had largely expired. Everyone understood that the intestate death of the last of

---

to implement. See A. Dembińska, *Polityczna walka o egzekucję dóbr królewskich w latach 1559–1564* (Warsaw: Nakład TN Warszawkiego, 1935); L. Kolankowski, *Polska Jagiellonów. Dzieje polityczne* (Lviv: Gubrynowicz i Syn, 1936); A. Sucheni-Grabowska, "Społeczność szlachecka a państwo," in *Polska—społeczeństwo—kultūra*, ed. Andrzej Wyczański (Warsaw: Wiedza Powszechna, 1986).

the male line of the Gediminid-Jagiellonian dynasty would complicate national life. This spurred Sigismund Augustus and both states' political communities to seek solutions. They feared that the ruler's death would lead to chaos, weaken both states, and unleash internal turmoil that would have unpredictable consequences with a war raging. The creation of a new Polish-Lithuanian union was of essence. The respective political nations, however, had to decide what relations the states should maintain and seek a consensus.

Thus began a new stage in the efforts to renew the union of Poland and Lithuania, the most complex one to that time. It was also a stage of adjusting to the conditions of a new epoch, which greatly affected the Polish and Lithuanian political nations and their cultures. The events of 1562 have changed the conventions of political processes.

The Polish-boyar Executionist movement was able to exploit the GDL's annexation of Livonia in 1561 and the consequences of this move. The positions of this opposition movement in Lesser Poland concerning Livonia, Lithuania, and Sigismund Augustus were reflected in their address to the king on March 19, 1562,[35] revealing a mechanism of political pressure on Sigismund Augustus. Concern was expressed several times that war over Livonia would force the king to reside in Lithuania for yet another lengthy period of time and to neglect Polish affairs. The boyars asked a rhetorical question: Was such behavior on the ruler's part a sign of disfavor toward the Kingdom of Poland, which faced dire threats from various directions to begin with? Sigismund Augustus was advised directly that he should take care of Polish matters first of all, hand down decisions on domestic and foreign issues, promise to spare the freedoms and rights that the boyars enjoyed from future violation, and undertake to convene a long-promised Polish Sejm that would begin to implement the Executionists' program and protect the state against the Turks, the Tatars, and other enemies.

The Executionists attained their goal. The Polish Sejm convened in Piotrków on November 29, 1562,[36] and it was there that the implementation

---

35 The address is published in "Posselstwo ku krolowy Je Mczi od slyachty mnieyssey Polsky z nowego Miasta," in *XVI amžiaus Lietuvos ir Lenkijos politinės kultūros šaltiniai (1562 metų tekstai)*, ed. Jūratė Kiaupienė (Vilnius: Eugrimas, 2008), 31–64 and 65–71. Sigismund Augustus's response to the envoys of the boyars of Lesser Poland on May 26, 1562, is published there as "Responsu Regia Maiestatis nunciis a nobilitate Minoris Poloniae Wilne Datum XXVI Maii Anno 1562."

36 The Piotrków diary of 1562–1563 is published in *Źródłopisma do dziejów Unii Korony Polskiej i W. X. Litewskiego*, ed. Adam Tytus Działyński, part 2, section 1 (Poznań: Ludwik Merzbach, 1861), 3–157.

of the Executionists' program began. The Sejm started to review the rights that landowners or their ancestors had received for service to their rulers. This was the first stage. Phase two was the confiscation and restitution to the state treasury of lands illegally held by magnates. The Sejm also discussed the Executionists' political demands. The Polish historian Ludwik Kolanowski called 1562 the year that Sigismund Augustus decided to go ahead with unification and began to create a single republic and boyar nation in both Poland and Lithuania.[37]

As it debated the future of such a union, the GDL's political community understood that if Sigismund Augustus's death were followed by the selection of a new ruler separately in Poland and in Lithuania, there was a high likelihood that two different rulers would be chosen. Such an act of disunity in wartime would be extremely dangerous for Lithuania because the country would find it difficult to band its defense forces together and could hardly expect military support from Poland.

The question of the future of the state was raised in 1562 by a mission representing the GDL boyar conscript army and those who had thought of and wrote the address to Sigismund Augustus.[38] The text of the address shows that the Lithuanian boyars wanted one ruler to be chosen, that a joint Sejm of the Kingdom of Poland and the Grand Duchy of Lithuania should make the selection, and that joint defense against outside enemies should be organized. However, the jointly chosen nominee as the King of Poland and the Grand Duke of Lithuania should have a separate ceremony at which he would be proclaimed the Grand Duke, this event should take place in the capital, Vilnius, and the jointly chosen ruler should ensure the GDL's rights and freedoms separately. The envisaged state would be comprised of two states, the Kingdom of Poland and the Grand Duchy of Lithuania. Their borders would remain the same, as would their individual governments, their officials, and armies. Furthermore, Sigismund Augustus was asked to reveal his possible candidate for the throne, who, as time

---

37 Kolankowski, *Polska Jagiellonów*, 211.

38 The address is published in "Poszelstwo Riczerstwa kxięstwa wielkiego Litewskiego kv kroliowy Je Mczi do Wilna zobozu," *XVI amžiaus Lietuvos ir Lenkijos politinės kultūros šaltiniai (1562 metų tekstai)*, 73–110. See ibid., 111–112, for Sigismund Augustus's response on September 24, 1562, to Lithuania's Council of Lords, officials, and all boyars who had gathered to join the army and were in their camp: September 24, 1562, "Odpis do Panov Rad ego k(o)r(olevskoe) m(i)l(o)sti na prozby ikh m(i)l(o)stei. Zhikgimont".

passed, could be offered by the Lithuanians to the Poles so that they could choose a new ruler together.

To sense the atmosphere of the time as it related to the political debates and differences between the Polish and the Lithuanian concepts of unification, one may compare the polemic political texts written in Poland with those produced in Lithuania.

In 1563, the famous Polish political publicist Stanisław Orzechowski (Orichovius) (1513–1566) wrote a biting political text titled *Quincunx*.[39] Composed for the boyar class of Poland, it set forth provisions for a union with Lithuania that were reinforced with arguments. Comparing the Kingdom of Poland with the Grand Duchy of Lithuania, Orzechowski indicates that the most important difference between the two is that Poland is a free kingdom, ruled by an elected king, whereas Lithuania is an unfree duchy, where the dukes wielded absolute power—which is evil. King Jogaila, as the Grand Duke of Lithuania, has handed Lithuania to the Poles as a vassal state, making him just like the Duke of Muscovy, namely a despot. He cannot be called a king in any way because a king, especially a Polish king, could never treat his kingdom as Jogaila does Lithuania because otherwise Poland would not be a free kingdom. Lithuania is as different from Poland as freedom is from captivity. Only by joining the Kingdom of Poland as one body, one heart, and one soul can Lithuania become free. Orzechowski encouraged Lithuania to view its situation with disgust and, with all possible celerity, transform its duchy into a kingdom, exchange the Lithuanian duke for a Polish king, replace its coarseness with Polish education, and do all of this as the Crown of Poland invites them to find shelter under its wing of freedom.

Orzechowski's text, bursting with glorification of Poland's and the Poles' freedom and disdain for Lithuania and Lithuanians, was widely read and discussed in Poland on the eve of the Union of Lublin. His remark about Jogaila's having handed the GDL to Poland as a gift would be repeated by Poland's politicians and members of the 1569 Lublin Sejm.

In Lithuania, a complex and multifaceted retort to Orzechowski's polemic appeared in 1563–1564—a text that literature and history researchers call one of the most famous Lithuanian publicistic works from the Renaissance period. The question of its authorship has not been fully resolved, but it is thought to

---

39 Originally *Quincunx, to jest wzór Korony Polskiej na cynku wystawiony przez Stanisława Orzechowskiego Okszyca z przemyskiej ziemi i za kolędę poslom koronnym do Warszawy na nowe lato roku pańskiego 1564 poslany* (Kraków: Drukarnia Łazarzowa, 1564).

have been sired by institutions and people associated with Mikołaj Radziwiłł the Black and Mikołaj Radziwiłł the Red and possibly initiated and written by writers and intellectuals in the GDL.

The work, titled "Conversation of a Pole with a Lithuanian,"[40] explains the concept of a well-structured state and union through the literary device of a discussion between two people, a Pole and a Lithuanian. The very first lines of the dialogue reveal where the roots of the miscommunication of these two sixteenth-century political nations lie:

> [The Pole:] What's ultimately wrong with you, dear brothers (we'll call you that as long as we have hope that, God grant us, at some point you'll be thankful for our brotherhood)? What's wrong is that, according to our old agreement, made with you by both by His Royal Grace, our ruler, as well as our forefathers, with one indivisible body, you don't want to be ruled by one head. It's as though you're scorning us, your brothers, with whom you're linked with sundry mutual ties, and as though you're repelling our great love; our freedom, a greater or more pleasant one we cannot find under the sun in our times. …
>
> [The Lithuanian, responding:] How little we understand one another! We would like to be unified; we want freedom, in which we have taken joy for a long time with God's will. By joining you, however, we fear the loss of our ancient and honorable state and, if we want to be good sons of our homeland, it will not suit us to lose it in the way that you are encouraging us to do….[41]

With emotions running high in the dispute, the anonymous author of "Conversation of a Pole with a Lithuanian" uses the character of the Lithuanian to formulate a view of the existing union and what to expect from the Polish side in the future if the Lithuanians wish to keep and solidify it. He wishes first of all to tear Lithuania away from its Muscovite enemy's suffocating hands. He encourages the other to set aside the lengthy Sejms and the

---

40 The Polish original is published as "Rozmowa Polaka z Litwinem / z ktorej tu snadnie kazdy obaczyć moze co jest prawa wolnosć / abo swoboda / i jakoby unią Korona Polska z Księstwem Litewskim przyjąć miała / przeciw sromotnemu i omylnemu Stanisława Orzechowskiego pisaniu / ktorym niewinnie sławne Księstwo Litewskie zelzyć chciał / uczyniona," ed. Regina Koženiauskienė, in *Šešioliktojo amžiaus raštija*, vol. 5 of *Senoji Lietuvos literatūra*, ed. Sigitas Narbutas (Vilnius: Pradai, 2000), 201–275.

41 Ibid., 115.

arguments, quarrels, and disagreements and to help the ruler, who for several years has been calling for Polish military support. Only then, he explains, will the Poles easily draw Lithuanians into a union that the Lithuanians need not fear because they understand well that unity is necessary. He emphasizes, however, that liberation from the enemy that has seized almost half of Lithuania must come first and that to form a perfect union the Lithuanians need not only part of Lithuania but all of it.[42]

The public dialogue between the Polish and Lithuanian political nations concerning unification began in the Warsaw Sejm in 1563–1564.[43] In December 1563, this assembly began to discuss the conditions for a unification agreement. First, high-ranking officials of the Kingdom of Poland laid out their views on the most important political aim of the Executionist policy and demanded the immediate inception of an all-out political reform of the state. The aim of this reform was to make a union with Lithuania that would turn the GDL into a province of the Kingdom of Poland and create an opportunity to fuse both entities into a single Polish state.

The Lithuanian delegation to the Warsaw Sejm comprised twenty-eight-members chosen by the Vilnius Sejm in 1563 as well as representatives of the Council of Lords, the districts, and the city of Vilnius. The envoys, representing the political communities of Lithuania, Samogitia, and the Rus′ lands were fully empowered to hold negotiations concerning unification.[44] Representatives of the Lithuanian Sejm were authorized to discuss all questions and make decisions on the joining together of the Kingdom of Poland and the Grand Duchy of Lithuania and, if needed, to swear in the names of all members of the Sejm.

The delegation was headed by Mikołaj Radziwiłł the Black, Chancellor of the GDL and Palatine of Vilnius. In his first opening speech, in celebratory and mellifluous political rhetoric, he reminded the ruler of the two nations and the members of the Polish Sejm that the Grand Duchy of Lithuania was a dynastic legacy, the patrimonial state of Sigismund Augustus, who, it seemed, would not leave a male heir. This is why he had to settle the unification issue in a way that would be attested not only on paper or parchment, festooned with

---

42 Ibid., 160–161.

43 The diary of this Sejm is published in Działyński, *Źródłopisma*, part 2, section 1, 187–418.

44 The delegation's journey and powers are published in Latin and Polish in "Zygmunt August król polski i wielki książę litewski wystawia pełnomocnictwo, dane przez sejm litewski posłom, wysłanym na sejm koronny dla zawarcia nowej unji z Polską," Wilno na sejmie, July 21, 1563, *Akta unji*, no. 87, 154–157.

seals, but in true equality of rights and freedom for both nations and states. Lithuania's political leader emphasized that the delegation of the Lithuanian Sejm represented the interests of the entire Lithuanian political nation and homeland and was ready and empowered to establish a union between equals. Such a union, he reminded his listeners, had been executed in Horodło and had blossomed, yielding wonderful fruits in both states' vineyards. Invoking ancient Greek wisdom, he said that Sigismund Augustus, having patrimonial rights to Lithuania's Vytis (the heraldic figure of the Lithuanian coat of arms) must deal with his own state before releasing this horse to graze freely as it should. After all, it was dangerous to have a fire lit by the enemy shining directly into one's eyes instead of flickering behind the border. He encouraged Sigismund Augustus to usher his states into the kind of union that would garner immortal fame in the memory of the inhabitants of the both states.[45]

The Lithuanian delegation checked into Warsaw with written instructions, issued on July 21, 1563, by the Vilnius Sejm with the approval of Sigismund Augustus. The directives clearly emphasized the total independence of the Lithuanian state and its equal rights vis-à-vis Poland. The envoys were empowered to tell the members of the Polish Sejm that Lithuania wished to uphold and sustain the kind of union that had been laid down by the enlightened rulers King Władysław II Jagiello and Grand Duke Alexander Vytautas—an entity embodied in one ruler of both states and nations. This ruler would be chosen from the dynasty of Jogaila and Vytautas and, upon the end of his reign, the Lithuanians and the Poles would choose a successor together in elections held near their shared border. The envoys were to demand a special privilege establishing a process in which representatives of the GDL would participate in the Polish capital, Kraków, in coronating the ruler chosen as King of Poland, and afterwards the envoys of the Crown of Poland would take part in crowning the Lithuanian Grand Duke in the Lithuanian capital, Vilnius. The Grand Duchy promised to march together with and to assist the Kingdom of Poland at all times and to conclude no agreements with its enemies; it insisted that the Poles, their union partner, assume the same obligations. The envoys were authorized to demand that these mutual obligations be expressed in writing. As for organizing the work of the Sejm, a suggestion was made to adhere to the procedure that had been laid down in the old privileges. Namely, important issues involving both states should be discussed and decided upon in joint Sejms; in

---

45 "Rzecz Pana Woiewody Wileńskiego, po przywitaniu ku Krolowi I. M. od Posłow Litewskich, około Uniej," Działyński, *Źródłopisma*, part 2, section 1, 238–241.

all other cases, separate Polish and Lithuanian Sejms should be convened and a delegation from the other union partner should participate in each. Most important, however, the envoys were to assure that the GDL's rights, freedoms, and class prerogatives guaranteed by the old privileges be neither violated nor diminished in the slightest, that the Lithuanian state and governing mechanism endure throughout the centuries, and that the borders between the states remain and be renewed so that bilateral relations not be impaired. Poles in Lithuania and Lithuanians in Poland should be allowed to freely purchase and land and other property, apply their own law on the purchased territories, and transport goods. They must return escaped subjects and servants, assure equality of rights among cities and inhabitants of both countries, and ensure that the capital of the GDL, Vilnius, be able to invoke the same rights, freedoms, and privileges that Kraków, capital of the Kingdom of Poland, enjoys.[46]

Tense and passionate political discussion concerning the conditions for an agreement on adjoining the two states followed the official opening speeches. Each country kept to its new understanding of the union and strove to bolster its position. A member of the Polish Sejm deeply aggrieved the representatives of Lithuania by suggesting during the debates that all lands of the GDL be called New Poland because, like Greater Poland and Lesser Poland, they would become property of the Polish Crown.[47]

Mikołaj Radziwiłł the Black, who had spoken on behalf of the Lithuanian delegation on several occasions during the discussions, reminded the members of the Polish Parliament more than once that they had to stick to the old agreements, which proved that since time immemorial the Lithuanian state was called the Grand Duchy of Lithuania, that its ruler held the title of grand Duke of Lithuania, and that its issues of state were dealt with by officials of its choosing. The head of the Lithuanian delegation addressed Sigismund Augustus and the Polish Sejm with a request: in making the union agreement, there should be no aspects that the ears of their forebears had not already heard. Responding, Radziwiłł the Black encouraged them to reread the old privileges, in which this was stipulated, and review the Lithuanian Statute as well. He reminded them that the Lithuanians wished to unite with Poland because they needed a union, which is why they came to the Polish Sejm. Noting that the delegation

---

46   The instruction, in Latin and Polish, is published in: "Zygmunt August król polski i wielki książę litewski podaje instrukcję, daną przez sejm litewski posłom, wysłanym na sejm koronny dla zawarcia nowej unji z Polską," Wilno na sejmie, July 21, 1563, *Akta unji*, no. 88, 158–176.

47   Ibid., 272.

had to carry out the negotiations within the framework of the instruction that the Vilnius Sejm had given them on July 21, 1563, he explained that the Poles had to understand what kind of union Lithuania wanted. He said that only the Lithuanian Sejm could introduce changes into the content of the Union with the Kingdom of Poland and encouraged Sigismund Augustus and the representatives of Poland to come and take part in the work of a future Sejm and continue the unification discussions.[48]

By implication, as became increasingly clear, it would not be possible to agree in Warsaw on terms of unification and the future shape of a joint state. Sigismund Augustus's pressure on the Lithuanian representatives did not help matters. Answering to the urging of the Polish Sejm, Sigismund Augustus declared that in striving to unite both states under his rule, he was willing to cede to the Republic the patrimonial rights to the Lithuanian state that he possessed as a member of the Gediminid-Jagiellonian dynasty, because he understood that the two states had been joined in one body since ancient times. He emphasized, however, that just as each part of a body is separate, so within one common republic each nation, the Polish and the Lithuanian, had its own rights, courts, and privileges—with no harm done to the union.[49] Thus, Sigismund Augustus explained his renunciation of his rights and confirmed it in writing—ratified, signed, and sealed—to the Polish Sejm, making it the law of the land in Poland.[50] Mikołaj Radziwiłł the Black responded to Sigismund Augustus's affirmation of faith in the Warsaw Sejm by stating once again that the incorporation question could be resolved only by the Lithuanian Sejm. Namely, this decision by the Lithuanian Grand Duke had to be discussed in the Lithuanian Sejm, and only the ruler could convene a sejm.[51] The unification talks were put on hold at the beginning of 1564 and the delegation of the Lithuanian Sejm left Warsaw. Upon the death of Radziwiłł the Black in 1565, the post of political leader of the GDL was entrusted to his cousin Mikołaj Radziwiłł the Red,

---

48 Mikołaj Radziwiłł the Black's speeches appear in the 1563–1564 Warsaw Sejm diary, published in Działyński, *Źródłopisma*, part 2, section 1.

49 The act is published in "Zygmunt August król polski i wielki książę litewski odstępuje sukcesję na wielkie księstwo litewskie Koronie polskiej i okreśa chrakter połączenia obu państw. (Deklaracja o unji litewskiej)." Warszawa na sejmie, March 13, 1564, *Akta unji*, no. 90, 179–180.

50 "Zygmunt August król polski i wielki książę litewski stwierdza przebieg sprawy unji Polski z Litwą na sejmie warszawskim 1563–4 r. (Reces w sprawie około unji litewskiej)," Warsaw, March 13, 1564, *Akta unji*, no. 91, 181–185.

51 See "Po Declaratiey Krolia J. M. Pan Woiewoda wilien, jął mowicz. In eum sensum," in Działyński, *Źródłopisma*, part 2, section 1, 366–367.

who also succeeded him as Palatine of Vilnius. The Sejms would revisit the unification question several times, but the countries' positions as stated in the 1563–1564 Warsaw Sejm did not change.

The Lithuanian historian Mečislovas Jučas explains the impasse. Based on his analysis of the 1501 Privilege of Mielnik, as set forth in the Brest Sejm on June 28, 1566, by Walerian Protasewicz—Bishop of Vilnius and a member of Lithuania's Council of Lords—Jučas adduces that Protasewicz may have been the author of the aforementioned 1563 Vilnius instruction. Protasewicz urged Lithuanian politicians to refrain from straying from the instruction and encouraged them to protect and defend the name and borders of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania as unification was supposed to create a joint republic comprised of both states. In Protasewicz's opinion, the term *communia consilia* (joint agreements), invoked in the 1501 unification talks, did not mean that the GDL's ancient Sejm and separate Council of Lords should be terminated. Neither had been renounced, he said. What is more, Protasewicz urged, Lithuania should even preserve its old ceremonial tradition of having the marshal present a sword to each person who is elevated to the post of Grand Duke.[52] Politicians from Poland and Lithuania brought these difficult-to-adapt political demands to the next common Sejm, held in Lublin in 1569 and again devoted to unification. The Polish and Lithuanian delegates, drafted from the membership of their respective Sejms, slowly began to gather in Lublin in late December 1568; the GDL mission arrived on December 31. By then, senators and representatives of the GDL chosen by boyars in the districts had met and discussed the kinds of political strategies and tactics that would be best to cling to as the renewal of the union with Poland would be debated. The GDL Sejm had received assurances from Sigismund Augustus that exeecution, the seizure of land holdings they had received from their rulers for their service and their return to the treasury would not be carried out in Lithuania, as it already was in Poland. Due to the events in Poland, it was important to ensure that changes to GDL land management rights were not implemented. The most important thing, however, was that they had received a guarantee that was recorded in the Privilege of Wohyń, a small city in the GDL area near the border with the Kingdom of Poland, where the GDL Sejm's envoys met with Sigismund Augustus on December 21, 1568.[53] In this document, Sigismund Augustus declared that

---

52 M. Jučas, *Lietuvos ir Lenkijos unija (XIV a. vid.—XIX a. per.)* (Vilnius: Aidai, 2000), 248–250.

53 The privilege is published in "Zygmunt August król polski i wielki książę litewski przyrzeka sejmowi litewskiemu, udającemu się do Liublina dla zawarcia unji, iż co do sposobu jej

no decision linked to the Lithuanian state could be adopted by the Lublin Sejm against Lithuania's will and that no document could be considered valid solely by being sealed by Crown of Poland, that is, without the GDL's seal. Sigismund Augustus also promised to not execute any unification decision with either side, the Polish or the Lithuanian side, absent the other side's consent. As the envoys of the GDL Sejm left for Lublin to negotiate the renewal of the union, they had in hand the Grand Duke's oath to preserve the sovereignty of the Lithuanian state for all times, as enshrined in the 1566 Second Lithuanian Statute.

The Lublin Sejm started its work on January 10, 1569. Concurrently, however, the Polish and Lithuanian Sejms convened and parted, their leaders drafting and submitting demands to one another, proposing projects for the future joint state, sending off petitions, and speaking separately with Sigismund Augustus. Sometimes the members of both Sejms met privately and discussed the situation. The joint work, however, was at an impasse.

Mikołaj Radziwiłł the Red, the political leader of the Lithuanian delegation, explained that the fruitful work of the joint Sejm could not begin because the Sejms of Poland and Lithuania were divided by "bars" (in Polish, *kraty*). One may understand what kind of bars he had in mind by reading his diary of the 1569 Lublin Sejm.[54] On one particular day, he wrote, the Poles were again stood up by the Lithuanians at a joint meeting that the king had promised them. Returning from the meeting hall in Lublin Castle, the Poles encountered members of the Lithuanian Sejm by accident and began to speak with them, inviting them to come, saying that the doors were open to them. Responding to their invitation, Radziwiłł the Red said that, while he knew the doors to Their Excellencies the Poles were open, there were bars that the Lithuanians could not pass until His Majesty the King would remove them. The members of the Lithuanian Sejm repeated this several times to the Poles in the first few months of the Lublin Sejm's work. Their purpose in saying this was that the Poles should not get angry and be patient. The Lithuanians could not reach out to them, they said, because first they must—together with Sigismund Augustus, as the Grand Duke of Lithuania—solve the most important issue, the one that precipitated the crisis: guaranteeing the freedoms and rights of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania. Radziwiłł the Red explained to the senators of Poland that the Lithuanians first had to receive guarantees of Lithuanian state

---

przeprowadzenia i co do treści będzie się przestrzegać pewnych określonych w tym akcie warunków," Wohyń, December 21, 1568, *Akta unji*, no. 95, 189–192.

54 *Dnevnik Liublinskago seima 1569 goda. Soedinenie Velikogo Kniazhestva Litovskogo s Korolevstvom Pol´skim* (Saint Petersburg: V. Golovin, 1869).

sovereignty from Sigismund Augustus, and the lords of Poland, in turn, should recognize the two nation, the GDL and Poland, as equal brothers. At this time, the sixteenth century, the words "nation" and "brothers" had meanings in both sides' political lexicons that differ from the way we understand them today. The word "nation" could be used in a broader sense, even as a synonym for "state," and as a denotation of the boyar class in the political sense. The word "brother" was used to show respect to members of the other nation as equals.

As the atmosphere of discord intensified, Lithuania began to doubt the amiable intentions of their brothers, those of the Polish Crown. The doubts escalated after Filip Padniewski, Bishop of Kraków, informed the Sejm on February 12, 1569, that the Lithuanian ruler Jogaila, upon becoming King of Poland, had surrendered his patrimony, the Grand Duchy of Lithuania, to Poland and adjoined it to the Crown, so that of the two nations only one nation and one body would remain. What is more, he stated, all the dukes, lords, and classes of Lithuania had given Jogaila's act their consent.[55]

Lithuania's political nation could not accept Poland's offer of unification, in which the nation would cease to crown its chosen ruler as the Grand Duke of Lithuania, allow rights to be exercised and documents to be ratified only under the single seal of the Crown of Poland, and invalidate the 1566 Lithuanian Statute. The GDL representatives construed this as an attempt by one brother, the Kingdom of Poland, to do away with the other, the Grand Duchy of Lithuania. Translating the idea in Mikołaj Radziwiłł the Red's diary concerning the Sejm into today's political language, one would understand that the Lithuanian politicians were dissatisfied with the behavior of Sigismund Augustus, who by declaring the renunciation of his patrimonial rights to the GDL in 1564, despite the guarantees in his 1568 Privilege of Wohyń, had

---

55 "Krol Jagello, maiącz sie tego y tak dokladaiącz (w) przywileiach swych y pierwszych y pos-lednich, ze byl wlasnem, a dziedzycznim panem wielkiego xiestwa Litewskiego, ktore dzier-zal zawsze, wziąwssy ie od przodkow swich zupelnim, a przyrodzonym prawem, iako tam serzei mowi, tedy chcząc s siebie zlozycz ten obowiązek, ktori byl koronnie uczinil, gdy go na krolewstwo obierano, odstąpil prawa successyei y dziedzyctwa swego, ktorekolwiek mial w xiestwie wielkiem Litewskim wiecznimy czasy i darowal them koronną Polską albo iuz thą iedną rzeczpospolitą, ze dwu narodow spoioną, a zatim zyednoczil to oboie panstwo; wsakze za przyzwoleniem wsitkich panow y rad y stanow inich Litewskich, ktorzy dobrowol-nie na tho zezwoliwszy, sami pothim spyski swemi tego poprawowali, wiznawaiącz tho, ze wiecznimi czassy chczą mieszkacz w braterskiey miloscz z narodem Polskiem. Witolda tez brata swego do tego bil przywiodl y insche xiazeta, ktorzy tez tam mieli dzialy swe, ze takze uczynili y wsitkie swe czyesci przywlasczili i przytaczyli do koronni, na czo są listy dostatec-zne." See "Mowa, ktorą jego moscz x. biskup Krakowski od panow rad coronnich czinil do ich mosciow panow Litewskich," in *Dnevnik Liublinskago seima 1569 goda*, 62–63.

fractured the sovereignty of the Lithuanian state and impeded the renewal of the union as a pact between two equal states and two political nations.

On February 28, 1569, Sigismund Augustus responded to the unyielding Lithuanian delegation by demanding that representatives of both Sejms gather on March 1 for a joint meeting. If this meeting fails to take place, he continued, he would declare the unification of the states under his rule and determine the form and makeup of the new entity himself. It was common knowledge at the time that Sigismund Augustus, the last Jagiellon, had chosen the Polish version of the unification project, which, if implemented, would spell the abolishment of the Lithuanian state. The political crisis deepened.

According to the Lublin Sejm diary, those who gathered for the Sejm meeting on March 1, 1569, found out that most members of the GDL Sejm had left Lublin and returned to Lithuania without bidding farewell and without officially informing either Sigismund Augustus or the members of the Polish Sejm, their partners in the political debate, of their act. This is how the Lithuanian Sejm responded to Sigismund Augustus's demand for unreserved obeisance and his threat to decide the unification issue on his own, without the approval of the Sejms.

In the historiography of the Union of Lublin and this behavior, the long-dominant interpretation offered by Polish historians had it that the GDL politicians' escape was a mistake, dictated by the hopelessness that overtook them once they understood that they could not change most of the Polish Sejm's positions and by the contrasting belief that they could change Sigismund Augustus's mind by stopping the work of the Lublin Sejm. This interpretation of events often recurs even in more recent research. Calling this act a mere escape, however, is incorrect for a formal legal reason alone. After all, according to the 1568 Privilege of Wohyń, issued by Sigismund Augustus, if the unification question were not completely resolved for some legal or other important reason that clashed with the freedoms of the GDL, or if Lithuanian representatives understood it as the humiliation of part or all of their state, then the Lithuanians had the right to leave the Crown of Poland's Sejm and lands freely. After the members of the Lithuanian Sejm heard Sigismund Augustus threaten to resolve the unification question on his own, and knowing that such a decision could be contrary to the interests of the Lithuanian state, they acted in accordance with the privilege. Thus their departure, interrupting their participation in the work of the 1569 Lublin Sejm, was altogether legal.

From the standpoint of political culture, this behavior may be seen as a rebellion against the ruler in defense of the state. In political theory, the

departure of the Lithuanian delegation from the Lublin Sejm qualifies as a parliamentary insurrection. By planning this action, the delegation had a clear aim, the implementation of which they prepared for in advance. It was organized and led by Mikołaj Radziwiłł the Red, whom the delegation recognized as its political leader. The Lithuanian Sejm mission stepped away from a joint session of the Polish-Lithuanian Sejm, officially informing neither Sigismund Augustus, who had convened the assembly, nor their partners in the parliamentary debate. The work of the Sejm was deliberately disrupted for a political aim. In the summer of 1569, the two countries under Sigismund Augustus's rule, Poland and Lithuania, were on the verge of armed conflict. The word *rebellio* ("rebellion") was used by the envoy of the Holy Roman Emperor who witnessed the events. In his report from Lublin dated May 18, 1569, he wrote, "It appears that the Lithuanians are merely fooling the king and the Poles and are cleverly continuing their negotiations for a union. Thus it is becoming clear that the matters are going more in the direction of *rebellionis* than [toward] harmony and union."[56]

In the meantime, the Polish Sejm in Lublin continued to go about its work. There, the radical-minded Executionists got their way by obtaining the support of Sigismund Augustus. The ruler declared that the status of the Podlasia and Volhynia palatinates, which belonged to the GDL, was being changed according to his will and would be annexed to the Kingdom of Poland. The participants in and observers of this conflict waited in suspense for the next events. Soon rumors arrived from Lublin that Lithuania had already formed a military alliance with the Crimean Tatars and begun military action against Poland. The tension grew. Boyar army conscription was declared in Poland.

The GDL political community mulled its next moves. Sigismund Augustus, the Lithuanian Grand Duke, and the Poles, who had called the Lithuanians brothers, had indeed snubbed the Lithuanian state and its entire boyar nation. As debate raged in Vilnius and the districts, the political nation prepared for a summit in Vilnius to which it invited the "rebels" of the Lublin Sejm. After the discussions, the participants in the meeting agreed that the Lithuanian Sejm delegation should return to Lublin and continue the parliamentary struggle there. Jan Hieronimowicz Chodkiewicz—Starosta of Samogitia, GDL Grand Marshal, and Governor of Livonia—was placed at its head. On March 22, 1569, the mission was handed a specially prepared instruction.[57] Upon arriving

---

56 The speech is kept in *Haus-, Hof-, und Staatsarchiv*, Vienna, Polen I, Carton 14, p. 49 v.

57 "Instructia Ich mzci panom Poslom Litewskim do ich mzci panow rad Coronnych odprawionym Je mxci panu Janowi Chodkiewiczowi Staroscie Zmudzkiemu Marszalkowi

at the Lublin Sejm, it was to address the leaders of the Polish Sejm and lay out the GDL's most important demands: to immediately stop the illegal tearing of the palatinates of Podlasia and Volhynia from the Lithuanian state and to have Sigismund Augustus call another joint Sejm for rediscussion of the union and future of the two states.

Things were also tense in the newly Polonized lands of Podlasia and Volhynia. The boyars of Volhynia, it seems, were not happy with the annexation. In the name of the Volhynian political community, a petition was sent to Sigismund Augustus on March 29, 1569.[58] Known as the Lutsk petition, the document expressed surprise about why Sigismund Augustus had sent the Volhynians a document written in Polish and sealed not with the seal of the GDL but with that of the Crown. The petitioners reminded Sigismund Augustus that until that time they had not been under the rule of the Crown of Poland; they were subordinate only to him and his forebears, who were first of all chosen in the GDL and not by the Poles of the Kingdom of Poland. Assuring Sigismund Augustus that they wished to remain his subjects and did not oppose brotherly union with the Poles, the Volhynian boyars wrote that they failed to understand why their ruler was demanding that representatives of their palatinate approach their ruler in Lublin and take up their place in the Sejm together with the Poles, emphasizing their utter disinterest in the kind of unity with the Polish boyars that would be forced on them by decrees.

The Lutsk petition suggests that a large number of Volhynia boyars had gathered for a sejmik—a district-level assembly—without Sigismund Augustus's knowledge, rejected his decision to annex their palatinate to the Crown of Poland, and insisted that the issue continue to be debated. They accepted the offer, expressed at the Vilnius summit, to call a new Sejm and find a solution to the issue in the parliament. The petition was delivered and presented to Sigismund Augustus by three representatives of well-known families from Volhynia. According to the historian Karol Mazur, who found this source,

---

Ziemskiemu Wielkiego XL Administratorowi y hetmanowi Ziemi Inflanskiey Jm Panu Jerzemu Osczikowi Woiewodzie Msczislawskiemu Jm Panu Pawlowi Paczowi Casztelanowi Witebskiemu a Panu Chrzistophowi Radziwilowi Krayczemu WKL, roku 1569 miesiącza marca 22 dnia," *Biblioteka Narodowa*, rpr 6601, Zbiór prawa polskiego z lat 1501–1573. Kodeks Mikolaja Lubomirskiego, 92–93.

58 The petition is published as "Petycja szlachty wołyńskiej do króla Zygmunta Augusta z prośbą o zwołanie nowego sejmu w sprawie unii polsko-litewskiej" (Łuck, March 29, 1569). See K. Mazur, "Nieznana petycja szlachty wołyńskiej do króla w dobie sejmu lubelskiego 1569 r.," *Sotsium* 2 (2003): 54–56.

all evidence indicates that the authors of the petition were associated with the Lithuanian opposition.[59]

The boyars of the Bratslav Palatinate, a territorial unit of GDL by 1569, were even more passionate in their opposition to the annexation of their territory to the Crown of Poland. On March 28, 1569, they laid out their apprehensions in a letter to Duke Roman Sanguszko, requesting that he, as the Palatine of Bratslav, defend them from the Poles' likely self-license and expressing their readiness to resist the "foreigners," having the Poles in mind. The letter was signed by four boyars in the name of the entire Bratslav Palatinate boyar class, with another five providing seals with which to certify it.[60]

The Lithuanian delegation's rebellion came to an end and the Lublin Sejm carried on with its work. The envoys to the GDL Sejm who had been appointed at the Vilnius summit reached Lublin on April 5, 1569, where they met with senators of the Kingdom of Poland. (Sigismund Augustus declined to take part in the meeting.) The new political leader of the delegation was Jan Chodkiewicz; Radziwiłł the Red did not return to the 1569 Lublin Sejm and would no longer participate directly in unification negotiations. Speaking on behalf of Lithuania and explaining why the Lithuanians had had to interrupt the negotiations and return to Vilnius for consultations with their political nation, Chodkiewicz first focused attention on the Crown's forced annexation of Podlasia and Volhynia. The GDL senators, he emphasized, neither felt nor thought that their departure from Lublin was a crime against the glorious Kingdom of Poland and its Sejm. His Excellency, he continued, had invited the senators of Lithuania to this joint Sejm for one purpose only: to effect a union between the two states and not to negotiate over Podlasia and Volhynia. This is why the Lithuanian senators did not understand why these lands had to be pried away from the GDL.[61] This poised speech by the head of the Lithuanian delegation, and the reasoned position that it articulated, bore witness to the level of maturity that the political community had attained and the roots of its understanding of its state's territorial integrity and sovereignty in historical memory.

Chodkiewicz's first speech after returning to the Lublin Sejm was only the beginning of a long political struggle for the preservation of the GDL's territorial

---

59 See K. Mazur, "Szlachta wołyńska wobec unii jagiellońskiej w dobie sejmu lubelskiego 1569 r.," *Przegląd Historyczny* 95, no. 1 (2004): 37–52; idem, *W stronę integracji z Koroną. Sejmiki Wołynia i Ukrainy w latach 1569–1648* (Warsaw: Neriton, 2006), 34–36.

60 Mazur, *W integracji z Koroną*, 34–35.

61 Chodkiewicz's speech, read from a document published in *Dnevnik Liublinskago seima 1569 goda*, 258–266.

sovereignty and integrity. The resumption of the unification negotiations resumed triggered nearly two months of passionate debates and attempts to find a springboard to a broader consensus. The 1569 Lublin Sejm diary is so voluminous (786 pages in large format) that I cannot discuss all of the speeches given there. I can only say that both the Lithuanian and the Polish senators stuck to their guns but sought ways to compromise. Thus, in the middle of June 1569, they reached terms and began to draft a final text for the act of uni-fication. It was on June 26, 1569, that Lithuania agreed to the union project that had been formulated. The next day, the details concerning the seal of the monarch and the status of Livonia (recognized as a territory jointly ruled by Lithuania and Poland) were finalized.

Time has preserved the documents of the 1569 Union of Lublin. By reading them, one not only discovers what the representatives of the political nations of Poland and Lithuania agreed on and what Sigismund Augustus rat-ified, but also the names of the signatories, their duties, and the atmosphere of politics in the sixteenth century. Two exact copies of the renewal of union acts were issued in the name of the members of the two Councils of Lords—of the Polish Crown and of the GDL—as well as envoys from lands belonging to them. One copy was ratified by the Kingdom of Poland and the other by signatories from the GDL.[62] Thus a new era in Lithuania's political culture commenced.

Symbolically speaking, the mood of the GDL's political nation after the 1569 Lublin Sejm may be broadly divided into two slants—optimistic and pessimistic. The pessimists claimed that the rebellion by "those arrogant mag-nates" had accomplished nothing. They had angered Sigismund Augustus and members of the Polish Sejm, then had lost Podlasia, Volhynia, and (later) other rich lands, and finally gave the Poles a chance to show their power. The Lithuanians had had to return to Lublin, endure humiliation, and succumb to their Polish "brothers" and accept their terms for the unification. Only Mikołaj Radziwiłł the Red had come away victorious: he was stubborn, didn't return to the Sejm, didn't lose respect, and placed the burden of further negotiations on the shoulders of his old rival, Jan Chodkiewicz. The pessimists felt that a positive outcome could not be expected—some boyars would surely have cut a deal long ago. So, Lithuanian districts asked for union to be brought from Lublin, while the lords of Vilnius were conniving as best they could, afraid

---

62   The texts of the documents are published in *440 lat Unii Polsko-Litewskiej / 440 metų Lenkijos-Lietuvos Unijai*, ed. Alfredas Bumblauskas (Warsaw: Galeria Polskiej Książki, 2009).

that the ruler would start taking holdings away from them and carrying out an executionist policy like in Poland. That's how this rebellion transpired, without its even having started. Its result was the Commonwealth of the Two Nations. The pessimists complained that in Lithuania, the new state was simply called "the Republic," while the Poles still referred to it by one word only: "Poland."

The optimists, seeing the brighter side of the political struggle, asserted that the 1569 rebellion united the Lithuanians and created a true political nation. As they thought, those who truly cared about the fate of the Lithuanian state should have understood that a joint front of boyars and magnates could accomplish much for the homeland. The optimists believed that the Lithuanian boyars' hearts were truly pained by what happened to their state. Though many of the boyars wanted unification, it was not just any union that they wanted, least of all the kind that the Poles envisioned. Returning from Lublin, the members of the Council of Lords called the Vilnius summit and discussed the issue with all of the nation. The results were clearly visible. Comparing what the Poles offered in their design for the union before our rebellion with the contents of the unification act that Sigismund Augustus ratified on July 1, 1569, the differences were evident. But the optimists felt that the fate of Lithuania's lost lands—Podlasia, Volhynia, Bratslav, and Kyiv—was sealed by the Poles long before the Lublin Sejm, except that the Polish politicians had not agreed among themselves about whether to take the lands by force or calmly wait until the Lithuanian state would become New Poland, a province of the Kingdom of Poland. Twenty years later, the optimists continued, everyone in the districts of the GDL is happy with Stephen Báthory's military victories over the Muscovites, proud of Vilnius University and the new 1588 Statute. They remembered how the Poles and Sigismund Augustus demanded the introduction of Polish law in Lithuania upon the unification—a demarche that failed. Now, there was Lithuanian Statute, a body separate from Poland and ratified by the ruler, Sigismund III Vasa, on which the Lithuanians had based our legal arguments in court. Moreover, the Lithuanian law (reflected in the 1566 Statute) remained in effect in the lands that were torn from Lithuania and ceded to Poland. On further examination of the text of the 1588 Lithuanian Statute, the optimists saw that the state of one "indivisible body," created on paper in the 1569 Union of Lublin, remained merely the dream of the Polish. What was created instead is a parliamentary monarchy with Poland and Lithuania as its members. The rebellion of March 1, 1569, was only the beginning. The optimists werw sure that time would come when historians would be proud of what GDL's political nation was able to accomplish in defending its state. The future historians

would certainly find that the Commonwealth of the Two Nations created by the Lublin Sejm was not just Poland but a composite state comprised of Poland and Lithuania and based on a treaty.

Coexistence between the two political nations began to evolve immediately after the execution of the Union of Lublin in 1569. Its initial period, lasting until Sigismund Augustus's death in 1572, unfolded in several different political spaces. Representatives of the Polish and Lithuanian political elites, as well as high-ranking officials of the two states, were personally acquainted before the renewal of the union and had much experience in communicating with one another. Until the 1569 union, in contrast, political contacts between the Lithuanian and Polish boyars were weak and political life in the districts was rather insular.

During the Union of Lublin's first few decades, Poland and Lithuania still had different political nations and aims. Each political nation formulated its own demands, drawing them from different concepts of the union and different understandings of the Commonwealth that had been established. The concepts persisted without change even after decades of discussion. The GDL's political community in 1569–1588, comprised of magnates and boyars, wished and was able to preserve a Lithuanian state and a Lithuanian political and legal identity. Lithuania's aim was not to break the Commonwealth of the Two Nations apart but simply to solidify the position of the GDL within it as a full-fledged independent state—the Kingdom of Poland's equal—and to restore its historical borders. The loss of land to Poland in 1569 strengthened GDL society's distrust in its partner, souring the atmosphere of domestic politics in the republic. The discord between the parts of the composite state also weakened the international standing of the whole. One should not, however, define the behavior of Lithuania's political nation as separatism. While Lithuania's position did not suit the interests of its partner, Poland, neither did it topple the Union of Lublin; instead, it forced Lithuania to seek compromise. One may say that the discussions about the makeup of the union that had taken place in Warsaw in 1563–1564, and in Lublin in 1569, continued.

There was one important place where the officials of Poland and Lithuania had to work together: the royal court of Sigismund Augustus, ruler of the Commonwealth, King of Poland, and Grand Duke of Lithuania. There they began to look for new points of departure in policy. The monarch's attitude also changed. As soon as he took the helm of the Commonwealth, Sigismund Augustus had to create a new forum for cooperation with the officials who represented each state in the joint entity. This was no easy task because his

relations with Lithuania's high-ranking officials had suffered greatly after he had breached the privileges he had given Lithuania, weakening the country's economic and military potential and offending the entire political nation with his unilateral decisions. Now he tried to soften the tension that had built up, calm Lithuania in his capacity as the Lithuanian Grand Duke, and get the contacts under way again. This, however, led to dissatisfaction among the Polish politicians and heated the atmosphere even more. Soon the officials of both countries found themselves in a heightened state of tension.

Historians have called the first decades of the Commonwealth of the Two Nations a time of "mutual reconciliation not lacking in quarrels and discord" and of "anger due to the continuance of the union," in an effort to emphasize disagreements and disputes between Lithuania and Poland on the union. "Quarrels" and "anger" here describe, first and foremost, the emotional atmosphere in which an overarching new coexistence in the joint commonwealth would be sought. The political atmosphere of the republic's domestic affairs is revealed in all its detail and mood in the Polish historian Henrik Lulewicz's monograph.[63] Thus, I will remind the reader only of a few of the most important events and attitudes of those participating in them.

Through Radziwiłł the Red and the influential leaders of the nobility, the Lithuanian political community hoped to fully establish its positions in Sigismund Augustus's court and corridors of power in the state apparatus. This strategy, adopted by the GDL representatives, proved to be the correct way to proceed; it gave them more chances to participate in future debates over issues pertaining of the joint state, assess the Kingdom of Poland's political mood and aims, and prepare for the first interregnum (that following Sigismund Augustus's death) and elections.

Historians highlight the fact that already in the first Sejms of the Commonwealth, the Lithuanian representatives limited their attention to issues that concerned their own state and distanced themselves from discussion and decision-making in matters related to the Kingdom of Poland. The Lithuanian boyars focused foremost on organizing to defend the GDL if were to prove unfeasible to extend the country's truce with Moscow. They took care that the ruler's courts, which were the state's highest instance of appeals, functioned smoothly. They proposed to put a rule in place whereby the ruler would

---

63 H. Lulewicz, *Gniewów o unię ciąg dalszy. Stosunki polsko-litewskie w latach 1569–1588* (Warsaw: Neriton, 2002).

reside alternately for a year in Poland and then a year in Lithuania, where he would govern in Vilnius on the basis of the Lithuanian Statute.

Poland's political nation had its own fears. After striving long and hard for a union into which Lithuania would be incorporated, ultimately it did not see its wish fulfilled. The English historian Robert Frost goes so far as to state that 1569 constituted a Lithuanian victory because the agreement in Lublin meant the triumph of the anti-incorporationist view of the union, which had been the Lithuanians' goal since the 1385 Act of Krėva.[64]

The 1385 Act of Krėva comprises 26 lines and 560 Latin words. It was written on a parchment to which were attached the seals of Grand Duke of Lithuania Jogaila, his brothers Skirgaila, Kaributas, and Lengvenis, and Jogaila's cousin, Vytautas. The seals disappeared during the nineteenth century, but the document is preserves in the chapter archive of Kraków Cathedral. There were not many conditions in this short document. However, one small word *applicare* caused great debate among historians. Historians suggest that its precise definition will provide insights about the nature of the 1385–1386 agreements between GDL and the Kingdom of Poland. Modern Lithuanian historians define the infamous word *applicare* as a neutral term which has no limited meaning of "incorporation." Rather, it reflects the broad promises made by Lihuanian princes in the wake of Jogaila's coronation or used in acts of fealty sworn by Jogaila and Jadwiga's Lithuanian vassals in chief. This vague but clear word, deliberately chosen for its broad sense, has given historians the opportunity to engage in a generaion-long dispute.

The modern historians draw two main conclusions: first, the Krėva act of August 14, 1385 is an authentic document. It is a "memorial" of the ratification of negotiations over Jogaila's marriage carried out in 1385. Secondly, there is no basis for calling this document an interstate or inter-dynastic treaty or an Act of Lithuano-Polish Union, *sensu strictu.* Lithuanian history has no interstate agreement that could be called "the 1385 Union of Krėva." On the invitation of the political elite of the Kingdom of Poland, Grand Duke Jogaila of Lithuania went to Poland, accepted baptism, married Jadwiga, and was crowned King of Poland, while also having patrimonial right to rule the Grand Duchy of Lithuania. Through marriage, a personal or dynastic union was created which was to have a lasting effect on East-Central Europe for several centuries.

---

64 The text of the document and its research are published in *1385 m. rugpjūčio 14 d. Krėvos aktas*, 135–143.

When evaluating the 1385–1386 contract, Robert Frost concludes, that formaly, it was an agreement between three parties: Jogaila, his pagan brothers, and Vytautas on the Lithuanian side; Elizabeth of Bosnia, the mother of Jadwiga, representing the Angevin dynasty; and envoys acting on behalf on the *corona regni Poloniae*, the community of the Polish realm. Krėva's wording suggests that the relationship forged in 1386 was intended to be far more than a personal or dynastic union: a multiple monarchy or dynastic agglomeration united solely in the person of the ruler.[65] Wacław Uruszczak presented a new interpretation of Polish historiography.[66] Contemporary scientists continue the dialogue. This victory was reflected in perhaps the most famous clause of the Lublin agreement: "That the King of Poland and the Grand Duchy of Lithuania already form one indivisible and uniform body, not distinct but composed of one common Republic in which one people is constituted and formed out of two states and two nations." Frost proposes to look at the period from Krėva to Lublin (1385–1569) not as a lengthy fight by Lithuanians to protect their sovereignty and independence, as it is often portrayed, but more as a dialogue, albeit an angry one, in which both political nations, the Polish and the Lithuanian, labored to define the state of their relationship and find an acceptable compromise.[67]

The Republic's first Sejms showed how strongly the theoretical notion of union was from the relationship that really existed among those who inhabited the joint state and decided its issues. Each political nation—the Lithuanian and the Polish—imagined union and coexistence in a joint state differently. The situation was further complicated with the impending end of the Gediminid-Jagiellonian dynasty, under which both nations had lived, as attested by Sigismund Augustus's quickly worsening health.

Sigismund Augustus, King of Poland and Grand Duke of Lithuania, died on July 7, 1572. The first interregnum had begun. It was a test for the Commonwealth of the Two Nations that had created in 1569 as a political body, as both political nations were called upon to ensure the full-fledged functioning of the state and choose a new ruler. In the next chapter, I examine the attitudes of the GDL's political nation at that challenging time.

---

65 Frost, *The Oxford History of Poland-Lithuania*, vol. 1, 50.

66 Wacław Uruszczak, *Unio regnorum sub una corona non causat eorum unitatem. Unia Polski i Litwy w krewie w 1385 r. Studium historyczno-prawne* (Kraków: Uniwersytet Jagielloński w Krakowie, 2017).

67 R. Frost, "Lenkijos ir Lietuvos unija Vazų valdymo laikotarpiu (1587–1668)," in *LIETUVA— LENKIJA—ŠVEDIJA: Europos dinastinės jungtys ir istoriniai-kultūriniai ryšiai*, ed. Eugenijus Saviščevas and Marius Uzorka (Vilnius: Nacionalinis muziejus Lietuvos Didžiosios Kunigaikštystės valdovų rūmai, 2014), 280–299. See also *Lietuvos istorija*, vol. 4 and vol. 5.

2 The State in the Political and Legal Culture of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania

It is not an easy task for a historian to address the modern reader about the Grand Duchy of Lithuania as a state and explain the intricacies of its political and legal culture. The main reason for this *problematique*, which recurs in regard to all European states, is that the word "state" has been understood in varied ways and its deeper meaning explained in a myriad of ways in different historical periods. The process of change in the meaning of the concept of "state" has its own rather lengthy history. There is much research in which authors explain and examine the appearance of the modern state from various vantage points and compare it with the medieval state.[1]

Changes in states and forms of rule in Europe, as well as their variety, are characteristic of the period. The medieval concepts of state, order, and type of rule evolved at the beginning of the early modern period into a new system of ruling ideology. The belief that the state was first and foremost a territorial body and not a dynastic, legal, religious, or cultural one began to gain steam. Territorial states became geographically more homogenous and "national." The number of states declined dramatically. According to Mark Greengrass's data, the number of independent states of various kinds in Europe plunged from about 1,000 in the fourteenth century to roughly half as many by the beginning of the sixteenth century.[2]

---

1 The main theoretical problems that attend to this approach, which are important for understanding the Grand Duchy of Lithuania as an early modern period state, are discussed by Alan Harding in his book *Medieval Law and the Foundations of the State* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001): 341–367. "The history of the state needs to keep in step with the changing uses of the word.... The problem is exactly how the idea of the state crystallized from uses of *status* by people who had no obligation to be precise and could not be consistent with a proper meaning yet to be established." He summarizes his remarks by saying, "The key to the history of the state is the development of the ambivalence which allows the word to signify both the ordered community which is to be loved and the regime which does the ordering and may be hated for its coercive power" ("Introduction. State: Word and Concept"), 1–9.

2 M. Greengrass and E. Arnold, eds., *Conquest and Coalescence. The Shaping of the State in Early Modern Europe*, 2nd edition (London: Edward Arnold, 1991), "Introduction."

The Lithuanian state founded in the middle of the thirteenth century, the metaphorical fruit of a political and legal culture, was one of those that remained. Unfortunately, the rulers of this pagan Lithuanian state left no written sources that describe their state, its structure, and its system of governance. Few texts allow us even to discuss the theoretical origins of these notions. In the Grand Duchy of Lithuania, relative to other European countries, very few discussions from the Middle Ages and the beginning of the early modern period have come down that would enlighten us about the nature and the rule of the state. It being known that original theoretical ideas were not widespread, historiography most often emphasizes the importance of Lithuania as the receiver of other countries' ideas and innovation and searches for what it adopted from its closest neighbors, such as Rus' and Poland, overlooking the role of a political or legal culture in the state's founding. This is partly because the Lithuanian state was established relatively late in comparison with other European states. Another very important reason is that for a long time, until the end of the fourteenth century, Lithuania remained a pagan land that had not created its own written culture. Lithuanian did not become the state language for official documents. Chancery Ruthenian, written in Cyrillic script, was long used for internal state matters; when this language was replaced in the seventeenth century, its successor was Polish. Written correspondence with other countries took place in Latin, German, and other tongues.

By the time Lithuania went Christian, a new kind of state—territorial and secular—existed in Western Europe, one that had reconceptualized its relationship with the ruler. The idea of the "mystical body" (*corpus mysticum*) and the "moral and political body" (*corpus morale et politicum*), that is, the political union that was responsible for the state's fate, were fused in the creation of this new concept. The state was now understood as a political body that had rights of its own, independent of the will of its ruler, and wealth of its own, independent of the ruler's wealth. Through his "marriage" with the state, the ruler gained the right to use its wealth but not to give it to anyone else. In fourteenth- and fifteenth-century France, this mystical body was understood as a union comprised of three classes. This union decided who would inherit the throne because the rule of the king was not his private domain but a public institution that belonged to the entire "body" (citizenry) of the kingdom. No sources exist that would prove that the founders of the Christian Lithuanian state knew of the concepts that the university professors in Paris had formulated on the basis

of the French model. There is no doubt, however, that these founders predicated their notion of the Gediminids' pagan monarchal state on medieval political practices and created a system of rule that conformed to the main European trends of the time.

At the beginning of the early modern period, various kinds of states coexisted in Europe—from empires all the way to republics. In some, traditions developed of strong centralized monarchal rule that later turned into Absolutism. Elsewhere, the rudiments of constitutionalism, based on cooperation between the monarch and institutions representing the classes, took root. The diversity of models of rule was greatly influenced by the different traditions in organizing governance that developed among specific countries. The changes that occurred were powered foremost not by the form of rule that a country chose but by a new kind of theoretical understanding of the state—no longer the one that had applied during the Middle Ages but instead the realization that the centralization of the state, the forming of classes, and the strengthening of class power were interrelated processes. These changes were linked with the spread of humanism and Renaissance culture as well as the Reformation and the ensuing reform of the Catholic Church. They triggered the formation of strong intellectual movements in Europe throughout the sixteenth century. Participants in these movements examined the problems of modern state and society through the prism of theory and discussed in texts what a state should be, how best to rule it, what relationship ties ruler to nation, whether the institutions that represented the classes need to keep the monarch's power in check, what sovereignty is and to whom the rights of a sovereign belong, and what tyranny is and whether it can be resisted. Thinkers discussed whether the rule of a king could be equated with the state, as had been the case in the Middle Ages, or whether rule should perhaps be understood as a duty or a service. Not only the most famous cultural and Church figures took part in these public debates; so did broader society, which found these new ideas electrifying. Those who initiated these discussions of the reconception of state and society, and went on to participate actively in them, were lawyers. Gathered at universities and advising monarchs in their courts and chancelleries, they created the theoretical foundations of the modern understanding of sovereignty.[3] It was in this atmosphere of discussion that the monopolization

---

3   See K. Pennington, *The Prince and the Law, 1200–1600. Sovereignty and Rights in the Western Legal Tradition* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1993). In discussing this study,

of power took place in many states on the basis of these new theoretical concepts such as the idea of a "stronger sovereign monarchy" or "absolutism" would be more appropriate.

There was no single accepted model of statehood for all European countries during the early modern period. Some rulers (such as those of France and Spain) strove to gather as much power as possible in their own hands, limit the rights of the classes to take part in governance, create a loyal system of administration controlled by the ruler, and weaken the power of parliamentary structures. Elsewhere (in England, for example), a path of cooperation between the monarch and institutions representing the classes was chosen. In the Kingdom of Poland and, later, in the Commonwealth of the Two Nations, when the monarch's rule lost traction his powers were taken over by the nobility and the parliament.

Is this claim, often repeated by historians, a good fit for the Kingdom of Poland and the Grand Duchy of Lithuania separately? I will attempt to answer by using sources on the legal and political culture. The quest is complicated by the lack of European-scale theoretical works on political thought that address themselves to matters of state, sovereignty, government, and society in the GDL between the second half of the fifteenth century and the first half of the seventeenth. However, in the opinion of the historian Ingė Lukšaitė, one can already see new traces of a mentality dealing with social theory in the texts of sixteenth-century thinkers. Having understood the needs of their state and society, intellectuals made efforts to discuss questions surrounding the development of state and society, elucidated social problems, and critically assessed the society of the time, from the 1550s onward. Both Catholics and pro-Reformationists were among those who advocated for reform. The writings of the GDL's Orthodox Church perpetuated the old traditions of using genres of religious, instructive, and enlightening nature; however, they slowly began to adapt these traditions to the needs of GDL society. These writings were based on the Byzantine cultural legacy and newly manifested contacts with European countries. Starting in the sixteenth century, one can observe the merging in the GDL of various writing traditions from Eastern, Central, and Western Europe.

Nederman emphasizes that "Pennington's approach sets up a dichotomy between continuity and rupture in this period that oversimplifies the complex patterns of persistence and change typical of medieval and early modern European thought" (*Parergon* 12, no. 2 [January 1995]: 223–225). It is important to keep this observation in mind when examining the state in the political and legal culture of the GDL.

During this time, however, the intellectual elite of the Orthodox community did not take an active part in discussions concerning the state. Its primary focus was not on issues of state and society but rather on the creation and distribution of religious writings.

GDL thinkers formulated various social reform projects through which the origins of a theory on social development in the GDL came into sight. Those writing on this subject based their work on the historical experience of the development of Christianity, their own societies, and European countries. They also predicated their writings on the works of the European thinkers from the second half of the sixteenth century who sired modern humanistic thought, including Justus Lipsius, Julius Caesar Scaliger, Jean Bodin, and Joannes Lodovicus Vives, among others. The culture and writting heritage of antiquity were an important basis for erudition and, very often, for individuals' views toward a theory of the society and forms that a state could have. By the sixteenth century, Lithuanian culture was able to adopt ideas, theories, and trends hands-on, with no need for mediators' assistance. Remaking some of these ideas and adapting them to their own purposes, the cultural agents of Lithuania used them to quicken the development of their culture and society, thus giving evidence of the maturity of Lithuania's intellectual culture at the time. The most significant element in laying the foundations of a GDL social theory and creating specific projects to better the state and society, however, was the reality of the Lithuanian state and its society at this time.[4]

Supporters of the Reformation were the most active in cultivating a critical relationship with the social reality of the GDL at the time. They based their work on the understanding of ancient and Renaissance society that had been recreated in academia around Europe at this time. Evangelical Reform believers who had banded in the last decades of the sixteenth century adopted a cooperative and disciplined approach to the creation of literary works that were relevant for the state and society.[5] The bedrock of this literature comprised

---

4 I. Lukšaitė, *Reformacija Lietuvos*, 501–530; see also her chapter "Visuomenės teorijos pradmenys Lietuvos Didžiojoje Kunigaikštystėje," in *Lietuvos istorija*, vol. 5, 557.

5 Lukšaitė treats the works of the authors belonging to this group as one unbroken phenomenon: Franciscus Gradovius, *Hodoeporicon Moschicum illustrissimi principis ac Domini Christophori Radivvilonis...* (Vilnius: Daniel Lenczycki, 1582); Helias Pilgrimovius, *Panegyrica Apostrophe ad Christophorum Radivilum* (Kraków: Andrea Petricovius, 1583); Andreas Rymsza, "*ΔΕΚΕΤΗΡΟΣ ΑΚΡΟΑΜΑ*, to iest dziesięćroczna powieść wojennych spraw Oświeconego księcia Krzysztofa Radziwiła (Vilnius: Daniel Lenczycki, 1585); Ioannis Radvani, *Radivilias sive, de Vita, at rebvs praeclamarissime memoriae ... principis Nicolai*

numerous genres, all of which, however, were linked by the values fostered by the Lithuanian state's political community. The works glorified officials of the GDL's state institutions and their concern for the state's defense and the preservation of its independence.

There were poets among this group, and experts on ancient Lithuanian literature call Jan Radwan (Lit. Jonas Radvanas, Lat. Ioannus Radvanus) the best of them. This is evidenced in his book *Radviliada* (Latin title—*Radvilias*), dedicated to the memory of the war leader and politician Mikołaj Radziwiłł the Red. Radwan's ambitions were much larger than those the others in his literary circle. In his book, written in Latin in the form of a lengthy poem, he celebrates the whole of Lithuanian history from the mythical Palemon to the death of Radziwiłł the Red in 1584 in a vivid rhymed retelling of both the Lithuanian state and the Radziwiłł clan. Radziwiłł the Red, the lyrical protagonist, is presented as having "restored" or "strengthened" his homeland (*sistit um patriam*). The poet recommends emphatically that the foundations of Lithuania's statehood, laid by Lithuanian Grand Duke Vytautas, should be preserved. The responsibility for carrying out this mandate is bestowed upon Radziwiłł the Red by the spirit of Vytautas. Just before his death, Hetman Radziwiłł prays for the Lithuanian state: "All I ask of You is this, Lord: having spared the Lithuanians, mightily bless Lithuania with the gift of a sceptre, honor, and glory" (quotation given from the translation of the original Latin text into Lithuanian).[6]

The generation of Evangelical Reform believers who lived in the Commonwealth and wrote texts on political culture spoke about the GDL not as a part of the Kingdom of Poland but as one of two strictly separate states. They celebrated Lithuania as a state that had its own past, couragous and wise rulers of noble origins who created a government by dint of their efforts. They understood the existence of leaders of noble standing, independent action, and a legacy of government were understood as components of Lithuania's statehood. The common ideas united the authors of these works into a group, and their literary output constituted the effort of like-minded people, figures of

---

Radivili.... (Vilnius, 1585); idem, *Epithalamium in nuptias Illustrissimi ac magnifici domini d. Christophorin Monvidi Dorohostayski, Magni Ducatus Lituaniae incisoris, ... et generosiss ac illustris virginis d. Sopphiae Chodkieviciae ... poetice expressum a Ioanne Radvano* (Vilnius: Salomonis Syltzeri, 1588), Lukšaitė, *Reformacija Lietuvos* (see the section "Santykis su Lietuvos Didžiosios Kunigaikštystės valstybingumu"), 535–536.

6 "*Tik, Visagali, prašau:pagailėjęs lietuvių, galingai / Lietuvai dar dovanok ir skeptrą, ir garbę, ir šlovę,*" Jonas Radvanas, *Radviliada*, ed. and transl. Sigitas Narbutas (Vilnius: Vaga, 1997), 231.

Reformation culture, and GDL officials to influence public self-awareness of the political nation. It was yet another attempt by a generation of the political nation that had experienced the Union of Lublin to preserve Lithuania's state-hood in the cultural and political consciousness. At the same time, it presented the next generation, which they felt was "standing at the door," with a mytholo-gized political and cultural testament.[7]

It is plainly evident, however, that state interests brought together people of different faiths in Renaissance-era Lithuania when the need arose. This is proven by the aforementioned "Conversation of a Pole and a Lithuanian," one of the most famous Lithuanian intellectual works of the mid-sixteenth century, written by one or more anonymous authors in the courts of both Radziwiłł the Black and Radziwiłł the Red. It is thought that Augustinus Rotundus (Augustyn Rotundus Mieleski), a Catholic, and the Protestant Andreas Volanus (Andrzej Wolan) were among them.[8] The work lays out, without deep theoretical expo-sition, a brief summary of the notion of the Lithuanian state. It emphasizes that the best and most suitable state is one ruled by one person, that is, a kingdom. This monarch, however, must be a real king and not just a titular one. If he lacks an innate regal soul (*animus*), he will never be a king, though he may be called one. Invoking Seneca, the authors emphasize that only the soul, not the title, distinguishes a king from a tyrant.[9] They show that in each state it is much easier to find a few good and wise people than to find many, and easier to search for one of them than for two or three. For this very reason, they continue, Plato elevated the rule of one over the rule of many or all. In the authors' opinion, the dukes knew the issues of their time better than all others did and knew what was necessary for the state. Although society might not construe this as freedom, in fact the surrender of their wealth and lives to the state, and saving

---

7 Lukšaitė, *Reformacija Lietuvos*, 530–548 (section "Santykis su Lietuvos Didžiosios Kunigaikštystės valstybingumu").

8 A. Jovaišas, "Augustino Rotundo Lietuvos valstybės vizija," in *Šešioliktojo amžiaus raštija*, vol. 5 of *Senoji Lietuvos literatūra*, ed. Sigitas Narbutas (Vilnius: Pradai, 2000), 75–114.

9 See Józef Korzeniowski, ed., *Rozmowa Polaka z Litwinem, 1564* (Kraków: Wydawnictwa Akademii Umiejętności, 1890), 207: "...przyznać musze to najpierwey / iż miedzy rzec-zami pospolitemi ta rzecz pospolita / w ktorey ieden panuie y krolestwem ią zową / iest nalepsza y ludziam nazdrowsza / wszakże tak / iesli then ieden prawym Krolem / rzeczą nie nazwiskiem thylko jest / bo nie będzieli Krolewski animus e nim / to nie będzie Krol choć go Krolem zową / iako tho Seneca napisał: eodem loco / quo ponimus latrones et piratas / ponendos esse reges latronum animum habentes / hic enim solus regem a tyranno distinguit non titulus."

the state, are not servitude at all.[10] They suggest that readers not fixate on the words but see the essence. If they do so, they will call both the Polish Kingdom and the Grand Duchy, because they have a single and at least nominally absolute ruler, a "monarchia"—a point that they stress by using the Greek word.[11]

Andreas Volanus's work "De Libertate politica, sive civili" (On political or civil liberty), written in 1571–1572 as the Commonwealth went through its initial formative period, is considered the most mature theoretical work of the time.[12] Volanus's thoughts are informed by three main sources: an education provided by European universities and urban culture, the Reformation in Europe and Lithuania, and the political and social *realia* of the GDL. His work is an effort to shape public opinion with arguments, show the direction in which Lithuania's legal reforms should head, and demonstrate what the country's future society should look like. The book is his contribution to the goals of what was called a "well-ordered society" as envisaged by Radziwiłł the Black, Radziwiłł the Red, and other participants in Lithuania's political nation. Striving to apply theoretical foundations of a philosophical slant to the idea of a "well-ordered society," Volanus combines the heritage of antiquity with the views of sixteenth-century West European Renaissance thinkers on social development and relies on the political and social experiences of other European countries (including Germany and the Republic of Venice). In his book *Commentariorum De Republica emendanda libri quinque* (Five books of commentaries on the improvement of the Commonwealth, 1551), Volanus, adapting some of the thoughts of the sixteenth-century Polish intellectual Andrzej Frycz Modrzewski (Andreas Fricius Modrevius), speaks of the "correction" of the Kingdom of Poland.

Some of Volanus's most positive suggestions were applied by politicians and lawyers of the post-Lublin Republic as well as the boyar class—those who drafted laws in the Sejms. His last-mentioned book often criticizes social phenomena that Volanus encountered in what he calls "our nation" and in the Republic, and also touches on the main structural elements of the Kingdom

---

10 Ibid., 237: "...w każdey rzeczy pospolitey / łacniey o iednego niż o dwu abo trzech / y przeto Plato przekłada iednego panowanie nad wielu abo wszytkich rząd. Łacniey Książęta na on czas mogli wiedzieć co rzeczy pospolitey pożyteczno / niższyscy więc / chociaż się pospolstwu niewola zdała y teraz podobno zda naszym / tedyć ono niewola nie była rzeczy pospolitey tey garłem y maiethnością służyć a ratować...."

11 Ibid., 255: "...A thu nie chwytaymy się słow / iuż Panstwo zowmy / choć Krolestwo / choć Księsthwo / owa iednego panowanie / po Grecku Monarchia...."

12 Originally titled *De libertate politica sive civili libellus lectu non indignus* and published in Andrius Volanas, *Rinktiniai raštai* (Vilnius: Mokslo ir enciklopedijų leidykla, 1996), 50

of Poland and the Grand Duchy of Lithuania. The book has a clear political motive—to provide the reading and thinking segment of society with criteria for the reformation of the social structure and the adoption of elements in neighboring countries' experience. It examines oppositions such as freedom and self-will, freedom and slavery, the civil freedom and the law, looks into the power of the highest authority and its limits, and the rights of the classes and of the individual in the state.[13]

Volanus returned to the same issues of state and society in a 1573 address to the Commonwealth Senate. In his *Oratio ad Senatum Regni Poloniae* (Address to the Senate of the Kingdom of Poland and the Grand Duchy of Lithuania, 1569), he discusses the flaws of the state that had been established in 1569, comments on its society, and examines issues in the relationship between monarchic rule and freedom.[14] He calls these flaws and issues "diseases" of the state and asks the senators to extend a hand of relief to the collapsing state, which is surrounded by numerous dangers.[15] Great dangers that will drive the state to the brink of total collapse are already visible, he emphasizes. Reminding the senators that the state's well-being and fate depend on their goodwill, he encourages them to choose a new ruler as quickly as possible. At the same time, he warns them that they must choose their ruler very wisely, so that citizens may see him as someone who is making decisions for the well-being of the country and not for its demise.

It is thought that during the first decades of the composite Polish-Lithuanian state, the political nation of the GDL understood Volanus's thinking very well and embraced his suggestion to elect a politically strong, morally steadfast ruler who would support the nation and take responsibility for the state's fate. The minds of Lithuania's political nation were not yet under the influence of the idea, originating in Poland, of the inalienable rights and freedoms of the boyar class, which would curb the ruler and his freedom to govern.

---

13 See I. Lukšaitė, "Andrius Volanas XVI-XVII a. Lietuvos visuomenės pertvarkos kryžkelėse," ibid., 27–48.

14 The full title of the book is *Oratio ad Senatum Regni Poloniae Magnique Ducatus Lituaniae qua boni Principis in Republica constituendi modus ostenditur*. It is published ibid., 182–189. The Latin original was prepared for publication by Eglė Patiejūnienė.

15 "Si quod unquam fuit tempus amplissimi Senatores, quo Respublica malis omnibus undique circumsepta auxilium et opem vestram implorare visa est: nunc certe ea est rerum omnium facies, hic communis fortunae habitus, ut nisi quamprimum labenti Reipublucae porrexeritis manum, illa in extremo iam discrimine constituta non procul ab interitu certaque pernicie distare videatur," ibid., 182.

Twenty-four years would pass after the inception of the Commonwealth until the Jesuit Piotr Skarga would write about six severe "diseases" of the state, explaining their precipitants to the Sejm and suggesting ways of "treating" them.[16] These two early modern thinkers who matured and wrote their works in the political climate of the Polish-Lithuanian state—the Calvinist Andreas Volanus and the Jesuit Piotr Skarga—were separated by opposing theological views on Christianity but were united by concern for the fate of the Polish-Lithuanian state and political acumen. In fact, Volanus, writing immediately after the 1569 Union of Lublin, still believed that the new Polish-Lithuanian state would solve the problems of the two political nations that had incubated it and expected these nations to settle on a suitable monarch. Skarga became a witness to the fact that it did not happen. On the contrary: the Commonwealth plunged even deeper into the quagmire of its internal political problems. Skarga's political diagnosis of the Republic's "diseases" showed that little had changed for the better over a quarter of a century and that the "diseases" of the state had actually worsened. The political communities of the Kingdom of Poland and the Grand Duchy of Lithuania, which ruled during the first decades of the new state, were unable to "treat" them.

Skarga became involved in the political life of the Commonwealth at a time when learned intellectuals, both Catholic and Protestant, debated the place of the clergy in society, the state, and politics. Discussions on the state, its governance, and society's participation in reforming it were an inseparable part of the early modern political culture. These multilayered exchanges of views, coupled with theological reflections, quickly took on a more political tone and reflected growing concern for the state and its fate.

The Jesuit order was founded in Europe to fight the Reformation and heresy. Its work however, was somewhat broader than mere struggle against the spread of new Christian beliefs. In the sixteenth century there were stormy discussions about the Church's adaptation to a changing society and the needs of the maturing early modern period. The Jesuit order was able to react to these challenges in a positive way, adjust to the cultures of Central Eastern Europe, and see a suitable strategy and tactics in its efforts to attain its goals.[17] The Jesuits, however, were constrained by their order's regulations against direct involvement in politics and influence on political decisions at the state level.

---

16 Piotr Skarga, *Kazania sejmowe*, ed. Janusz Tazbir with Mirosław Korolka (Wrocław: Zakład Narodowy im. Ossolińskich, 2008).

17 *Lietuvos istorija*, vol. 5, 388.

They could develop theories of statehood because this endeavor was separate from the concreteness of politics and limited any aim of participating in politics. Nevertheless, politically minded members of the order were able to circumvent the restrictions and became active creators and fosterers of political culture in the early modern period. They even found opportunities to enter political life when they were invited to a ruler's court. Skarga's participation in Commonwealth political life as part of the king's court and a preacher in the Sejm proves this. He not only worked extensively in pastoral services, wrote polemical works on religious issues, and was integral in founding a Jesuit-run education system but was also actively involved in the political life of Poland and, several years later, that of Lithuania. In the Commonwealth public sphere, he quickly became a visible figure, though one that had its detractors.

Skarga was thoroughly familiar with the common trends of state development that were emerging in early modern Europe and the ongoing discussions of its nature and problems. In addition, he organized the Jesuit education system in the GDL and was the first rector of Jesuit Academy in Vilnius (subsequently a university).[18] Well versed in the internal situation and problems of both the Kingdom of Poland and the Grand Duchy of Lithuania, he participated in Sejms and communicated closely with rulers Stephen Báthory and Sigismund III Vasa as well as representatives of both states' political elites. His work in organizing the Jesuits' secondary and higher education system in the Commonwealth was also incentivized him to participate in public debate about the reasons for the illness of the state organism, it being his hope to focus the attention of academically trained young people, future participants in sejmiks and Sejms, on these issues and to suggest ways to treat the "diseases" of the state. His multifaceted interests, broad education, rich European intellectual and political experience, and solid grounding in the political life of the Commonwealth were the main elements that formed Skarga's view of the state, its rule, and the behavior and attitudes of the ruling boyar class vis-à-vis the monarchy. They gave him the intellectual impetus to formulate and lay out his own ideas in his "Sejm Sermons." Researchers of this work assign it to the genre of political writing and emphasize that the content of the sermons, which were

---

18 For more on Skarga's work in education in the GDL, see Paulius Rabikauskas, *Vilniaus akademija ir Lietuvos jėzuitai*, comp. Liudas Jovaiša (Vilnius: Aidai, 2002); Alfredas Bumblauskas, Zenonas Butkus et al., *Alma Mater Vilnensis: Vilniaus universiteto istorijos bruožai* (Vilnius: Vilniaus universiteto leidykla, 2009), 113–172; *Lietuvos istorija*, vol. 5, 375–391. The last mentioned source includes a list of additional works that deal with the topic.

published in 1597, as well as Skarga's commentary on them are an inseparable from the rest of the political culture of the time.[19]

In his "Sejm Sermons," Skarga directs his harshest criticism at the Homeland Crown (his term for the composite state created in 1569), the unfettered freedoms that the ruling community enjoyed, and the weakening of the king's governing powers. Identifying the members of the Chamber of Envoys of the Commonwealth Sejm as the main culprits, he excoriates these boyars as provincial and politically immature. Basing his argument on examples, he warns them that their conduct may very well spell the demise of the state because democracy, the worst and most harmful form of rule in any case, is wholly unsuited to such a large kingdom.[20]

Thus far I have given a concise overview of the intellectual atmosphere of the GDL in the second half of the sixteenth century, as created by the most famous writers of political works. What is more difficult is to determine how widely this political literature reached ordinary members of the political community in the districts and what effect it had on their political thought and manner of speaking. Here the sources have little to say. One can only glean kernels of information from them and subject these fragments to a specialized kind of analysis. This is not a task for one researcher alone; it demands a specific methodology and consultation with experts on ancient GDL languages and literature as well as historians.[21]

The raising and discussion of everyday internal problems of state and society are dominant in the GDL sources. Theoretical insights are very rare and those that occur are not expanded upon and, most often, are tied to concrete needs of society. Thus, they offer one example of the expression of political culture in texts. In 1618, before the beginning of the Sejm of the Commonwealth, the

---

19 See Eugenija Ulčinaitė, "Petro Skargos 'Seimo pamokslai': retorikos ir didaktikos dermė," in *Petras Skarga. Seimo pamokslai*, ed. Viktorija Vaitkevičiūtė (Vilnius: Lietuvių literatūros ir tautosakos institutas, 2014), 9–21; Skarga's texts are examined within the context of Jesuit political thought in Romanas Plečkaitis, *Lietuvos filosofijos istorija*, vol. 1: *Viduramžiai—Renesansas—Naujieji amžiai* (Vilnius: Kultūros, filosofijos ir meno institutas, 2004), 485–505.

20 See chapter 6, "O monarchijej i królestwie, abo o czwartej chorobie Rzeczypospolitej, która jest z osłabienia królewskiej dostojności i władzej," in Piotr Skarga, *Kazania sejmowe*, 113–138.

21 Polish scholars have begun to carry out such research. See U. Augustyniak, "Polska i łacińska terminologia ustrojowa w publicystyce politycznej epoki Wazów," in *Łacina jako język elit*, ed. Jerzy Axer (Warsaw: DiG), 33–72; M. Janicki, "Wolność i równość w języku prawno-politycznym oraz ideologii szlachty polskiej (od XIV do początku XVII wieku)," ibid., 73–107; E. J. Głębicka, "Pojęcia *populus* i *libertas* w politycznych traktatach Andrzeja Maksymiliana Fredry," ibid., 109–120.

General Sejmik of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania met in Slonim.[22] In the introduction to a resolution of the General Sejmik of the GDL adopted in Slonim—alleging that the Republic homeland was being persecuted by "diseases"—the text called for a search for a "medicine" with which to treat them. In the resolution, the members of the Sejmik recognized and celebrated the ruler Sigismund III Vasa's "fatherly efforts" to correct the state's flaws. They rejoiced in the valor of Sigismund III Vasa's son, Prince Władysław IV Vasa, during an expedition to Moscow, as well as his dedication to and his love and care for the Republic's two constituent states.[23]

---

22   The General Sejmik of Grand Duchy of Lithuania was the intermediate between the Sejm and particular sejmiks (parliamentary bodies at the local level, where noble citizens participated). Sejmiks called "general" emerged at variuos times in different provinces;they convened: in Great Poland—at Koło, in Little Poland—at Nowy Korczyn, in Royal Prussia—at Grudziądz or Malbork, in Masovia—at Warsaw, in the Grand Duchy of Lithunia—at Volkovysk and then at Dlonim, in Podlasie (sporadically)—at Drohiczyn or Bransk. In the sixteenth century, the general sejmiks, aimed at finding the common ground for all participants from a particular province towards a royal proposal, gathered before the Sejms fairly regularly, and were attended by local senators and deputies of the sejmiks. There were some local differences in their structure. To the nobility, the general sejmiks were an important and much-needed institution. See: Urszula Augustyniak, *History of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth. State—Society—Culture*, ed. Iwo Hryniewicz, transl. Grażyna Waluga and Dorota Sobstel (Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 2015), 110–111.

23   See *Akta zjazdów stanów Wielkiego Księstwa Litewskiego*, vol. 2: *Okresy panowań krów elekcyjnych, XVI-XVII wiek*, ed. Henryk Lulewicz (Warszawa: Neriton, 2009), no. 30, 235–236 (*Uchwała zjazdu przedsejmowego, Słonim, 1.II.1618 r.*), Postanowienie nas rad i posłów ziemskich WKsL na zjazd główny słonimski d(ie) 30 Januari w roku 1618 przed sejmem walnym warszawskim przypadający zgromadzonych:

Im częstsze o R(zecz)p(ospolitą) a ojczyznę naszę otrącają się impety, im w ściślejszych za natarciem różnych niebezpieczeństw stawa angustiach, im uraźliwsze choroby i dotkliwe barzo miewa na się agones, tym znaczniejszą w poratowaniu dogodę, tym wdzięczniejsze z złej tonie wyswobodzenie, tym smaczniejsze na takie przypadki lekarstwo, uznawać zgodnie musiemy. A iż to wszytko naprzód się za powodem dziwnej opatrzności Bożej dzieje, potym też pochodzi z czulego i nieustawającego JKM starania, który ojcowskim prawie uwiedzony ku nam będąc affektem u styru R(zeczy)p(ospoli) tej siedząc, a niebezpiecznie na tę nawę ojczyzny naszej upatrując nawalności, to sam ad intricem inanum podawać, to remiges, którzy w tej łódce pracują, upomnianiem i przestrogami swymi pobudzać, to na ostatek ze wszech miar paternas torgas i w oganianiu externae securitatis i w zatrzymaniu domesticae quietia, oświadczać raczy. Przeto ojczyzna nasza przystojną takowe staranie JKM rekoligując wdzięcznością winne JKM oddawa dzięki. Co my wszyscy rada i posłowie WKsL na sejmie przyszły(m) ante omnia wykonać mamy. Uznawamy to wszyscy, że Królewic JM [Władysław Waza] pracami, fatygami i własnego zdrowia odwagą, znaczną chęć i miłość ku panstwom R(zeczy)p(ospoli) tej i ojczyzny naszej oświadczył. Cieszymy się z tego, że taka JKM fortunnie się dotąd nadawała ochota.

Polish historians, whose contribution to this field of research is somewhat larger, have detected a similiar situation in Poland, observing that the Kingdom of Poland's political thought was not marked by originality until the 1660s and rarely reflected the debates that were current in Western Europe. Polish authors who wrote on the subject concentrated on a select number of internal issues. This state of affairs traces to the low level of education of the seventeenth-century Polish boyar class, its scanty opportunities to obtain Western schooling, and intellectual ties that had begun to weaken.[24]

At the beginning of the early modern period, the GDL's political nation focused its attention on practical policies for their state—an approach that largely determined their political and legal culture and the forms of expressing it—and not on theoretical elucidation and discussion. The state was central throughout. According to modern historians, one important way to get to know the nature of a state is through its symbols of power and rule and their meanings and use. In European historiography, the German historian Persy Ernst Schramm is considered the pioneer of this kind of research.[25] His work laid the foundations for researching the connections among the state, the government, and political culture that represented it in different European countries throughout history.

The GDL coat of arms, flag, seals, ruler's insignia, coins, and other attributes of power and symbols of statehood began to develop in the Middle Ages. The initiative for creating them depended on the ruling Gediminid dynasty and the rulers whom it generated. Their purpose was to advise people of the dynasty, the state, and the ruler's personality, intentions, and feats in the language of symbols. What matters in getting to know the political culture is to reveal the ties that this language created between signs of power and the political community and to show how symbols of state influenced the political

---

Życzymy na ostatek, aby w dalszym tej ekspedycyjej progresie fortunatos successus z sławą swoją nieśmiertelną a z skutecznym ojczyzny nasej uspokojeniem Królewic JM uznawał. Jakośmy przed tym do wyprawy Królewi(ica) JM nie byli pośledniejszymi, tak i teraz w sparciu JKM zamysłów ile enervatae ojczyzny naszej dopuszczą vires, które ledwie nie ex ultimo pochodzą conatu nie będziemy na zadzie z swoją pozostawać ochotą. Tego jednak nie bez przyczyny afektuemy, aby transakcyja z strony ekspedycyjej moskiewskiej na przyszłym uczyniona sejmie, in suo zostawała robore."

24 Urszula Augustyniak, *Wazowie i "królowie rodacy." Studium władzy królewskiej w Rzeczypospolitej XVII wieku* (Warsaw: Wydawnictwo naukowe Semper, 1999), 20–44.

25 For the most important research on political culture by Schramm and like-minded scholars, see Percy Ernst Schramm, *Herrschaftszeichen und Staatssymbolik*, parts 1–3 (Stuttgart: Hiersemann, 1954–1956), and idem, *Kaiser, Könige und Päpste*, parts 1–4 (Stuttgart: Hiersemann, 1968–1971).

nation's self-awareness. Thus a system of Lithuanian government symbols was invented and adapted to changing circumstances over many centuries. The process of creating and acquainting the citizenry with them was complicated by the coronation of Jogaila, a representative of the Gediminid dynasty, as King of Poland. This necessitated efforts to harmonize both states' symbols of power and their use and to do the utmost to enable both political communities to understand them.[26]

Seals figure importantly in every state's set of symbols. Their heraldry and its underlying idea illuminate the structure of the state and the political aims and ambitions of those in power. It was via documents festooned with seals that those in power made contact with society. The seals that were devised and invoked in the Middle Ages represented the Lithuanian state not only at home but also abroad. The Lithuanian ruler's system of heraldry signs and the procedure for their use were formed during the reign of Grand Duke Vytautas. The armored rider with shield and sword in hand represented the Lithuanian state for more than four hundred years. Only in 1795, when Lithuania came under Russian Imperial rule, was it abolished.

The Lithuanian coat of arms is one of the oldest of its kind in Europe and one of the few that derive their symbols not from a dynastic coat of arms, as in most European countries, but from a portrait seal of dukes. The first coat-of-arms specimen, depicting Lithuanian Grand Duke Algirdas on his horse, may date to the fourteenth century. However, Algirdas's seal, applied to a 1366 agreement with Poland, has not survived. After the death of Algirdas, his successor Jogaila and Jogaila's brothers had more than one portrait seal featuring a mounted knight. It is from these seals that the coat of arms of the Lithuanian ruler and state emerged. The first official who gave meaning to this image was Vytautas when he became Grand Duke of Lithuania, as evidenced prominently in a coat of arms seal from the early fifteenth century. It depicts Vytautas— now Vytautas the Great—surrounded by the coats of arms of the lands that belonged to him, clutching a sword in one hand, signifying his ducal highness, and a raised shield with a mounted rider on it in the other, a globe-like image that symbolized his rule over the Lithuanian state.[27]

---

26 The meanings of the symbols of power of Poland and Lithuania as were created during the rule of the Gediminid-Jagiellonian dynasty, the changes they underwent, and their links to ideology and political culture are examined in Z. Piech, *Monety, pieczęcie i herby w systemie symboli władzy Jagiellonów* (Warsaw: DiG, 2003). A bibliography of research on the issue is also included.

27 Rimša, *Heraldry,* 56–66.

In the history of GDL sigillography, the Lithuanian historian Edmundas Rimša singles out the great seal of Alexander, who became Lithuanian Grand Duke in 1492. According to Rimša, it was probably the Lithuanian chancellor who came up with the concept of this great seal, which itself was produced by an accomplished artisan in Vilnius. In lieu of a medieval portrait, the seal in question presents a more modern symbol that is better suited to the modern spirit: the state's coat of arms. The heraldry on Alexander's seal reflected the contents of the 1492 privilege, which instructed the Grand Duke to defend the state's sovereignty and to preserve or even expand its borders as had existed in Vytautas's time. The seal also gave meaning to the new concept of the GDL as a sovereign state in the late fifteenth century. Alexander's great seal had particular representational importance. The heraldry of this particular object highlighted not only the origins of the Lithuanian Grand Duke and his ties with venerable European dynasties but also the state that he ruled. It did so by separately emphasizing the lands that were farthest away from the core Lithuanian lands, those that the country's neighbors coveted in wars. This late-fifteenth-century concept of the great seal remained largely unchanged until the Union of Lublin.[28] At first, the great seals were used rarely, generally for only the most important documents. They began to appear more widely during the reign of Stephen Báthory (1576–1586), when they showed up not only on privileges, the most important writings, and court decisions, but also on copies from Lithuania's chancellery archives and even letters from the ruler and court summonses.[29]

It was in medieval Lithuania that two other common heraldry symbols in public life appeared alongside the state coat of arms: the double cross and the Gediminid columns. The former was a symbol of Jogaila and the Jagiellonian dynasty; the latter was Lithuanian Grand Duke Vytautas's coat of arms, by now emblematic of the Gediminid dynasty. To understand the situation at the time, one should keep in mind that the ruling dynasty was understood somewhat differently in Lithuania than it was in Poland. For Poles, it meant the Jagiellons, represented by the double cross; for Lithuanians it was the Gediminids, represented by the columns.

---

28 Edmundas Rimša, "Aleksandro antspaudai—naujas etapas valstybės sfragistikoje," in *Lietuvos didysis kunigaikštis Aleksandras ir jo epocha. Mokslinių straipsnių rinkinys*, ed. Daiva Steponavičienė (Vilnius: Vilniaus pilių valstybinio kultūrinio rezervato direkcija, 2007), 152–165.

29 Edmundas Rimša, "Stepono Batoro Lietuvos didieji antspaudai ir jų atsiradimo aplinkybės," *Lietuvos istorijos metraštis* 2 (2001): 213–228.

The coat of arms with the columns is perhaps the symbol most shrouded in legend. At the beginning of the sixteenth century, Lithuanian chroniclers referred to the images on the coat of arms as columns and attributed them to Palemon, the legendary patriarch of the Gediminid dynasty, who had come to Lithuania from Italy. Lithuanian heraldry researcher Rimša writes:

> Probably this coat of arms is most interwined with legend. Early in the sixteenth century, Lithuanian chroniclers named the charge on the arm-spales (actually pillars or columns) and attributed them to the legendary Palemonas, presumably the first in the line of the Gediminaitis Dynasty, who had arrived to Lithuania from Italy. Later, this symbols was associated with denotations, used by persons from Genoa, the Tatars, Slavs, Skandinavians, and even Japanese.[30]

In the GDL, the Gediminid columns were used much more widely than was the double cross. They were depicted on Lithuanian coins from the fourteenth century onward and on the great seals of the Lithuanian state from 1581 to 1795. They were reproduced in municipal seals, book illustrations, works by goldsmiths in Vilnius, and other contexts.

The late fourteenth century saw the appearance of coats of arms of the GDL lands, showing their state affiliation. It was on Vytautas's aforementioned great seal that the coats of arms of Vilnius, Trakai, Volhynia, and Smolensk were depicted for the first time. The coats of Vilnius and Trakai represented the most important Lithuanian territories in the state; those of Volhynia and Smolensk stood for the most important southern and eastern Rus' lands that Lithuania possessed. By putting all of them on one seal, Vytautas intended to show via heraldry not only his state but also himself as its sovereign ruler. The oldest coats of arms depicting the Vilnius and Trakai lands are West European specimens from the first half of the fifteenth century.

As time passed, the number of Lithuania's coats of arms grew and their imagery changed. As the centralization of the state advanced, among other circumstances, the number of lands declined. Palatinates ruled by a central government took their place. The creation of palatinates and smaller administrative districts culminated with the judicial and administrative reform of 1565–1566. From then on, all GDL palatinates and districts had to place the Lithuanian mounted knight on their seals and flags. Similarly, the Second

---

30 Rimša, *Heraldry*, 73–75.

Lithuanian Statute (1566) and the Third Lithuanian Statute (1588) required the placement of the Lithuanian coat of arms on palatinate and district seals.[31]

The roots of the Lithuanian state flag go back to the beginning of the fifteenth century if not earlier. In the second half of the fifteenth century, according to the Polish chronicler Jan Długosz, Lithuanian Grand Duke Vytautas brought forty regiments with him to the Battle of Žalgiris against the Teutonic Order. All of them flew red flags. An armored knight bearing a raised sword was sewn onto thirty of these flags; sewn onto the other ten were the Gediminid columns. The regiments brought by individual Gediminid dukes and the participating GDL lands took these flags into the battle. The flag is yet another important sign of Lithuanian statehood. At first, a red flag with a white mounted knight represented the Lithuanian Grand Duke. Later on, starting in the second half of the sixteenth century and lasting until the end of the eighteenth, it represented the GDL state.[32]

The use of the GDL's symbols of statehood burgeoned in society from the fifteenth century to the first half of the seventeenth century and became an inseparable part of public culture. The 1569 Union of Lublin was unable, in itself, to erase them from the memory of the political nation. Even after the creation of the Commonwealth of the Two Nations in 1569, the state heraldry of the GDL persisted in public life, especially since the documents of the Union of Lublin made no reference to a coat of arms for the new composite state. As time passed, however, the coat of arms of Sigismund Augustus, the first ruler of the post-Lublin state, was accepted as the new coat of arms without a special act. Two sections of this coat bear a depiction of the Polish Crown's heraldic eagle; the other parts feature the GDL's mounted knight. The sections are joined in the middle by the coat of arms of the incumbent ruler. There was no specific Commonwealth seal. Separate seals of the Polish Crown and the GDL were used in the public life of the state. They were changed whenever a new leader was chosen because each seal featured the name of the incumbent monarch and grand duke.[33]

During the reign of Polish King and Lithuanian Grand Duke Sigismund III Vasa (1587–1632), several state seals were used concurrently. Among the most important were the ruler's majestic seal, the great and small seal of the Polish Crown, and the great and small seal of the GDL. In 1589, the mounted-knight

---

31 About Territorial Coat of Arms of the GDL see more in Rimša, *Heraldry*, 95–106.
32 Rimša, *Heraldry*, 77–81.
33 Henryk Wisner, *Rzeczpospolita Wazów*, vol. 3: *Sławne Państwo, Wielkie Księstwo Litewskie* (Warsaw: Neriton, 2008), 38–39.

coat of arms, surrounded by twelve coats of arms, was depicted on the Lithuanian great seal of Sigismund III Vasa. These coats of arms featured the eagle of the Polish Crown, the owl of the Vasa dynasty's coat of arms, the Jagiellonian cross, the columns of the Gediminids, and the coats of arms of the individual lands. The layout of these heraldic symbols bears witness to the sovereign's right to the lands shown on the seal. It is important in terms of the expression of Lithuania's statehood that some of these coats of arms represent lands that were separated from the Lithuanian state and ceded to the Kingdom of Poland twenty years prior, in 1569. There is no doubt that those behind the concept of the new ruler-associated Lithuanian seals aimed to show that the GDL was an equal partner of the Kingdom of Poland in the Commonwealth. Where Lithuanian state's great seal is concerned, this concept, with minor adjustments, remained essentially the same until 1795. The idea behind it may have come from Leon Sapieha, one of the GDL's political leaders; its manufacture may be credited to the Vilnius goldsmith Johan Dyla Sawicz. The main heraldic figure on the GDL's small seal, exactly like that on the great one, is the Lithuanian mounted knight, but unlike the great seal it is not surrounded with a wreath of other coats of arms. The heraldic symbol of a duke's crown recurs in both seals. Around 1635, the crowns that were used until then were replaced with a modern ducal hat. This feature, like a sign that set the GDL apart, remained in use until the end of the eighteenth century.[34] After the Union of Lublin, the rulers of the Commonwealth were given the title of Polish King and Lithuanian Grand Duke; only the coronation ceremony for the ruler of the GDL in Vilnius was abolished.[35]

The GDL distinguished itself from other states in the region in the seventeenth century with its strong legal culture. Three compendiums of working laws were compiled during the sixteenth century (1529, 1566, and 1588). Known collectively as the "Lithuanian Statutes," they codify the main principles of the structure of the Lithuanian state and society in legal language. The Statutes bore witness to the existence of the state, its concept, and its structure. They may be read as texts that bring together the legal and political cultures.[36] The effect on political culture is best seen by the laying out of public

---

34 Edmundas Rimša, "Nowe dane o litewskich pieczęciach państwowych Zygmunta III Wazy," in *Litwa w epoce Wazów*, ed. Wojciech Kriegseisen and Andrzej Rachuba (Warsaw: Neriton, 2006), 157–174.

35 Gitana Zujienė, *Insignijos ir ceremonialas Lietuvos viešajame gyvenime (XIII–XVIII a)* (Vilnius: Eugrimas, 2008). See "Summary," 297–333.

36 For more on the interaction of legal and political cultures in the GDL until 1569 and while the GDL was part of the Commonwealth, see Stanisław Estreicher, "Kultura prawnicza w

(political) rights. A differentiation between public and private law in the GDL's legal system came into effect with the ratification of the Second Lithuanian Statute in 1566. It may be possible to research Lithuanian political law from then on by invoking the sociological concept of law. Thus law may be seen not only as a collection of statutory norms and principles but as a much broader social phenomenon and legal system that, in its makeup, was greatly affected by the history, culture, and social and political value system of the Lithuanian nation.[37] The term "political law," as put forward and explained by the legal historian Andrzej B. Zakrzewski, shows that law was divided into legal law and political law starting in the sixteenth century. The dichotomy is explained via the tradition in Roman law of separating private law from public law. The Lithuanian Statutes were prepared and written just as West European law had gone through an intense process of Romanization. The concept of Roman law (of the Latin, and not the Byzantine, persuasion) also had an influence on the Lithuanian Statutes. From the first half of the sixteenth century onward, political law formed the understanding of the rule of law among the boyar class in the GDL.[38] Continuing his idea, one should emphasize that the Statutes not

---

Polsce XVI wieku," in *Kultura staropolska*, ed. Roman Pollack and Teodor Ignacy (Kraków: Polska Akademia Umiejętności, 1932), 40–118; Stanisław Russocki, "Kultura polityczna i prawna (Refleksje historyka ustroju)," *Historyka. Studia metodologiczne* XI (1981): 17–33; Marek Sobolewski, "Polska kultura polityczna i prawna w dawnych wiekach. Próba charakterystyki," *Czasopismo Prawno-Historyczne* 35, no. 2 (1983): 69–95; Stanisław Russocki, "Wokół pojęcia kultury prawnej," *Przegląd Humanistyczny* 11–12, 15–22 (1986); Katarzyna Sójka-Zielińska, "Stanisława Russockiego dyskurs historyczny o kulturze prawnej," in *Stanisław Russocki—badacz dziejów ustroju i prawa. W 45-lecie pracy naukowej*, ed. Honorata Dziewanowska (Warsaw: Wydawnictwa Uniwersytetu Warszawskiego, 1999), 31–39; Ewa Borkowska-Bagieńska, "O pożytkach badań nad kulturą prawną," in *Prace tysiąclecia: państwo—prawo—jednostka*, ed. Adam Lityński and Marian Mikołajczak, vol. 3 (Katowice: Uniwersytet Śląski, 2001), 28–40; Anna Rosner, "Badania nad kulturą prawną. Próba zarysowania problematyki," in *Z dziejów kultury prawnej. Studia ofiarowane Profesorowi Juliuszowi Bardachowi w dziewięćdziesięciolecie urodzin*, ed. Honorata Dziewanowska (Warsaw: Liber, 2004), 585–597; Stanisław Grodziski, *Z dziejów staropolskiej kultury prawnej* (Kraków: Universitas, 2004); Andrzej Zakrzewski, "O kulturze prawnej Wielkiego Księstwa Litewskiego XVI–XVIII wieku," in *Kultura i języki Wielkiego Księstwa Litewskiego*, ed. M. T. Lizisowa (Kraków: Collegium Columbinum, 2005); idem, "Statuty w kulturze prawnej Wielkiego Księstwa Litewskiego," in *Pirmasis Lietuvos Statutas ir epocha*, comp. Irena Valikonytė and Lirija Steponavičienė (Vilnius: Vilniaus universiteto leidykla, 2005), 177–194; Jevgenij Machovenko, "Lietuvos viešosios teisės iki XVIII a. pabaigos istorijos tyrimų būklė ir perspektyvos," *Teisė* 79 (2011): 31–32.

37 Machovenko, "Lietuvos viešosios teisės," 23–25.

38 Andrzej B. Zakrzewski, *Wielkie Księstwo Litewskie (XVI–XVIII w.). Prawo—ustrój—społeczeństwo* (Warsaw: Campidoglio, 2013), 237–240.

only strengthened the political community's belief in the power of law but taught the community how to invoke the spirit of law in politics. One rarely encounters the concept of "spirit of law" in lawyers' vocabulary. For a historian of political culture, however, it unlocks the possibility of understanding law as an independent act, as one of the reasons for the development of society, economy, politics, intellect, morality, and religion, and not only as a consequence of this development.[39] The "spirit of law" reveals the participation of legal texts and the meanings encrypted in them in forming a society's values. This is why the public law set forth in the Statutes is one of the most important sources for research on the political culture of the Grand Duchy.

The beginning of the sixteenth century saw the onset of active interaction between the legal and political cultures in the GDL.[40] The compilation of a compendium of GDL laws was publicly declared for the first time in a 1501 privilege from Grand Duke Alexander to Volhynia. The idea of codifying the law was raised by the Vilnius Sejm. A plan for what would become the future First Statute was discussed by the Vilnius Sejm in the middle of 1522, and on December 6 of that year Sigismund the Old ordered the code of laws to be published. This was not done, however, as the 1524 and 1526 Sejms failed to ratify the Statute for various domestic and international reasons. Only in 1529 did the Vilnius Sejm ratify the First Lithuanian Statute.[41] Even so, after a few years of public discussion, the Statute had a great impact on the political community and demonstrated the community's ability to participate in the lawmaking process.

One of the main sources of the Statute was Lithuanian customary law. Unlike the medieval legal customs of many European countries, Lithuania's were not written down. That they existed, however, is proven by the inclusion of several legal norms relating to specific customs in written court minutes from the late fifteenth century to the early sixteenth. It was at the latter

---

39   Harold J. Berman, *Law and Revolution. The Formation of the Western Legal Tradition* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1983).

40   About legal and cultural relations in Lithuanian law see: Juliusz Bardach, "Statuty litewskie w ich kręgu prawno-kulturowym," in his *O dawnej i niedawnej Litwie*, part 1: *Dawne prawo* (Poznań: Wydawnictwo Naukowe UAM, 1988), 9–71.

41   The translations of the First Lithuanian Statute of 1529 are published in English as *The Lithuanian Statute of 1529*, ed. and transl. Karl von Loewe (Leiden: Brill, 1976); and the collection *Pirmasis Lietuvos Statutas*, ed. Edvardas Gudavičius (Vilnius, Artlora, 2014), 36–223. There one can find the most recent conclusions of Lithuanian historians and researchers on the First Lithuanian Statute of 1529: Edvardas Gudavičius and Irena Valikonytė, "Pirmojo Lietuvos Statuto vieta valstybės ir teisės istorijoje," ibid., 8–35.

time that the concept of law started to develop in the GDL. This is evidenced in the appearance of the terms "Lithuanian law," "law of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania," and "law of the country" in historical sources. The foundation for Lithuania's written law was the class privileges issued by Grand Duke Jogaila (1377–1381, 1382–1392) and later by other grand dukes. It is there that we find the formulation of the core principles of Lithuania's legal system. Some sections in these privileges (especially those of a 1477 privilege from Casimir and another in 1492 from Alexander) became the first sections of corresponding chapters in the First Lithuanian Statute. Additional sources of the Statute were the court books of the Grand Duke's chancellery, first kept regularly in Lithuania in 1480, in which legal practices were written down. The practices of the courts in the first quarter of the sixteenth century may be considered the main source of the Statute. It was they that fashioned Lithuanian law and ideas borrowed from other countries' statutes into a functioning state law.

The original texts of all three Lithuanian Statutes were written in Cyrillic script and in Ruthenian, the domestic vernacular in the GDL. Although the First Lithuanian Statute was not printed, it was needed for judges in their everyday work. Thus, it began to be copied immediately after it appeared. The copies captured society's interest and led to the first campaign for the production and distribution of additional copies of the Lithuanian legal code as well as discussions about its content. The 1530 Statute was translated into Latin and, around the middle of the sixteenth century, into Polish. (The manuscript has not survived.)[42]

The first half of the sixteenth century was an extremely intense period in the development of the Lithuanian state. Society and its life were changing quickly. Some phenomena that went out of fashion vanished without a trace; others made a grand entrance into life and forced the revision, improvement, and adaptation to the new conditions of many well-established norms. On the heels of the enactment of the First Lithuanian Statute in 1529, new legal norms appeared in rulers' privileges and decisions of the Sejms. The legal codex had to be supplemented with these norms and decisions because they had become part of quotidian legal practice. The first up-front public demand for the revision of the Lithuanian Statute occurred at the 1544 Brest Sejm. The ruler, Sigismund Augustus, acceded to this and suggested the creation of a special commission. Motions seconding the intention of revising and supplementing the Statute were raised in five subsequent Sejms: in 1547, 1551, 1554, 1559,

---

42   Gudavičius and Valikonytė, "Pirmojo Lietuvos Statuto," 8–20.

and 1563. The 1564 Sejm was of extreme importance in terms of the legal and political culture. It was there that fundamental forms for the domestic life of society in the GDL began to be implemented.

The most important decisions were issued by Sigismund Augustus in the privileges of July 1, 1564, and December 30, 1565. Here the Lithuanian magnates waived the privileges they had been given in the 1529 Lithuanian Statute, which had set them apart from the boyar masses. In Sigismund Augustus's new writs, it was stated clearly that a uniform system of courts would be introduced, applying equally to magnates and boyars in districts that should be created, and that limitations for both classes would be set.[43]

As a new redaction of the Statute was being prepared, there was much discussion about privileges at the level of lands that past rulers had provided. The envoys of the separate lands of the GDL thought these entitlements should be recorded in the Statute, fearing that otherwise the rights that for which they had fought to that point would be violated. Ultimately, the 1565 Vilnius Sejm cleared up these issues. The new redaction, the Second Lithuanian Statute, went into effect on March 1, 1566.[44] It legalized the mid-sixteenth century reforms that had yielded the understanding of a boyar class and a model for the formation of a class monarchy, entitling the boyars to take part in resolving issues of state, making and enforcing law, and participating in the administration. The 1566 Second Lithuanian Statute legitimized the GDL Sejm as an institution of the boyar class, on which it bestowed the highest prerogative of legislating laws and gave the boyars the right, when the need arose, to call Sejms, even though normally this was done by the ruler. This made the boyar political nation, by now mindful of the importance of a legal state and its own rights, a maker of law. The administrative and legal units—the districts that formed in the GDL in 1564–1566—not only became foundations for the structure of the land courts but also gave the country's class and political organization its shape. New seals bearing the emblems of state were issued to all districts and given to the scribes of the district land courts through the media of the ruler's envoys.

---

43 When the court and administration reforms began in 1566, the GDL was comprised of thirteen palatinates, in which there were thirty districts in all (in 1569, nine palatinates and twenty-two districts remained). See Darius Vilimas, *Lietuvos Didžiosios Kunigaikštystės Žemės teismo sistemos formavimasis* (Vilnius: Lietuvos istorijos instituto leidykla, 2006), summary: "The formation of the land court system of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania (1564–1588)."

44 Ivan Lappo, *1588 metų Lietuvos Statutas*, vol. 1, *Tyrinėjimas*, part 1 (Kaunas: Akc "Spindulio" B-ves spaustuvė, 1934), 1–217.

The debate surrounding the Statute released a flurry of political activity in the GDL's boyar community. More and more boyars became active in district public life. They took interest in what was being discussed in the Sejms and discussed the pluses and minuses of the new court system and the individuals who were chosen as its judges. The network of these newly created land courts spanned the entirety of the GDL. According to Darius Vilimas, some 260 officials worked in the new district land courts during the 1566–1600 period.[45] They became the disseminators of a new legal culture. Judging by their wealth, most of the land court judges belonged to the mid-level boyar class. They did not, however, constitute a formalized group. They were regularly augmented by new members from the petty boyar class and were left by individuals who moved into careers in the high ranks of the state service. Work in a district land court not only guaranteed a salary but also provided the chance to receive larger social and political authority in the district as well as work experience in a state position.

The changes that were sweeping the boyar community are illustrated well by the "Document from the Samogitian Land State Officials and All Nobility to Starosta Jan Chodkiewicz concerning the Introduction of the Second Statute," issued in the Samogitian town of Wieszwiany on May 1, 1565. As the Second Lithuanian Statute was being prepared, the Samogitians were among those who stubbornly demanded that it enshrine the ancient land privileges. In a 1565 request, the Samogitians remarked that they had received a document from Sigismund Augustus in 1564 concerning their journey to a GDL congress that had been called in Minsk, where together with the Council of Lords they were to choose judges, vice-judges, and scribes. At the time, however, they were not able to go to Minsk for several important reasons. For one, they had gathered near the border with Livonia in order to protect the country from the Muscovite army. Thus it was decided by the Samogitian Land officials and nobles that the intended meeting would take place on May 1 of the following year in the Samogitian town of Wieszwiany, where the Samogitians would be able to choose judges, vice-judges, and scribes for their own land. When the day came, after they had gathered and made a decision among themselves, the representatives of the Samogitian boyars advised their Starosta, Jan Chodkiewicz, that not having seen the new Statute they feared that its norms would violate the freedoms and privileges that Samogitia had received from ruler Sigismund

---

45 A list of them can be found as "LDK pavietų Žemės teismų pareigūnų 1566–1600 m. sąrašas," in Vilimas, *Lietuvos Didžiosios,* 135–158.

Augustus and his ancestors. Realizing, however, that they could not survive without their own courts,[46] the deputies form Samogitia asked Chodkiewicz whether he, notwithstanding his important state duties, would agree to be their judge and adjudicate court cases in accordance with the First Lithuanian Statute. As they saw it, Chodkiewicz should retain the post until they would receive the text of the new Statute. At that point, once convinced that its legal norms would not violate their old freedoms and privileges, they would choose new judges, vice-judges, and scribes from their own number. When the starosta promised to honor their request, the boyars presented him with a signed and sealed document that formalized it.

The Samogitians' document carries neither the names nor the signatures of the participants in the aforementioned congress. Instead, it bears a sealed joint signature that identifies those responsible for the document as "the *Tivuny* [administrative officers] and All Nobility of the Land of Samogitia."[47] The seals

---

46 For more information about the court system of the GDL see Zakrzewski, *Wielkie Księstwo Litewskie*, 177–214; and Augustyniak, *History of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth*, 131–135.

47 "Shto ego krolevskaia milost´ nash milostivyi pan rachil kazati cherez listy svoi gospodarskie do Menska den sv. Tomasha proshlago ku ikh milosti panom padam z″ekhati dlia obirania sudei, podsutkov i pisarov vodlug zostanovenia soimu Belskogo, ino my tivuny i vsia shliakhta zemli Zhomoitskoe na tot chas u Mensku vodlug rockazania gospodar´skogo dlia nekotorykh pevnykh prichin byti i togo stanoviti ne mogli, a za tym ku granitsam Vikhlianskim ku otporu nepriiiateliu oberneny esmo byli i buduchi u Chadosech na voine sami esmo mezhi soboiu za onym pervshem roskazanem gospodars´skim postanovili chas pevny zlozhili dnia segodniashnego do Sholkian mesetsa maia pervogo dnia z″ekhavshi dlia obirania sudei, podsudkov i pisarov namovu chinili. Nizhli ne maiuchi ani videchi Statutu novogo a presteregaiuchi togo aby tot Statut novy volnostiam nachim ot prodkov ego krolevskoe milosti i ot ego kpolevskoe milosti pana nashogo milostivogo Zhikgimonta Avgusta nam nadany protivny ne byl, a videchi byti velikuiu trudnost i doleglost v zamkneniu sprav cudovykh i nechineniu spravedlivosti, kotopye chrez ego milosti pana Iana Eronimovicha Khodkevicha pana starostu nashogo Zhomoitskogo derzhavtsu Plotelskogo i Telshovskogo zostanovehy i zamseneny byli, s takovoe prichiny namovivshise esmo odnostalnym obychaem i pozvolivshi na to vsi, abykhmo upadku vnechineniu spravedlivosti nepryimali oto esmo rgo milosti svoego milostivogo pana prozbami i cholombitem nashim po kolku krot uzhivali, aby ego milost´ neliutuiuchi pratsy svoei panskei rachil nas sam osoboiu svoeiu panskoiu suditi i podstarostemu svoemu podle starogo obychaiu kazal spravovati do tykh mest poki my Statut novyi ot ego korolevskoe mlkosti dociagnem i s nego porozumene ozmem, zheby nam i volnostiam nashim niiakogo ushchypku ne bylo, i poki tezh sudi mezhi soboiu oberet i postanovit. Gde ego milost nash milostivyi pan na prozby nashy spravy sydovye podle davnogo ogychaiu i starogo Statutu na osobu svoiu panskuiu i na vriad svoi prniati obetsati rachil uchinivshi nam z laski svoei panskoi folkgu v dokhodekh vriadovykh vodle prozb nashikh zakhovati. Kotorykh prozb nashikh daem ego milosti panu staroste nashomu tot nash list pod nashimi pechatmi. Pisanv Shovkianakh Leta Bozhego Narozhen´ia tisecha piatsot shestdesiat piatogo

confirm that some 120 Samogitian nobles had taken part in the assembly. There may have been even more, of course. In the middle of the sixteenth century, petty boyars often had no signet seals. Thus they could participate in a gathering such as this congress and express their opinions without leaving traces of their identity behind. Either way, the number of participants is indicative of the active position of the members of Samogitia's political community. For comparison's sake, seventy-seven seals affixed to the 1569 Union of Lublin act were of Lithuanian provenance. The makeup and number of participants at the Wieszwiany gathering, along with the importance of the issues decided upon there, are equal to those of later sejmiks and issues that have been examined. This is why, in Rimša's opinion, it would be no great exaggeration to say that this congress of Samogitians should be considered the first known Lithuanian regional sejmik—to be more precise, the Samogitian sejmik.[48]

The modernization of the GDL's structure then under way was hindered and subsequently halted by the decisions of the 1569 Lublin Sejm. In the centuries that have passed since these events, historians and lawyers have debated the kind of state and political "body" that this Sejm brought into being, how to describe the state structure that came about, and how to depict the political communities that created it. The question they wish to answer is why no common law for the entire state was legislated. Unless these and other questions that concern the status of the new state and how it was understood are formulated, the further development of the GDL's political culture will be difficult to understand.

These discussions, I venture to say, were spurred on by those who had created this political body: Polish King and Lithuanian Grand Duke Sigismund Augustus and the members of the Sejms of both the Kingdom and the Grand Duchy. Even as they adopted the resolution of July 1, 1569, they failed to provide either a precise name for the state thus created or a description of its structure and legal foundations for their contemporaries and for posterity. It took until August 11, 1569,[49] for the first ruler of this newly created political body, the

---

mesetsa maia pervogo dnia. Tivunove i vcia shliakhta zemli Zhomoitskoe," *Žemaitijos žemės tijūnų ir visų kilmingųjų raštas dėl Antrojo Statuto įvedimo*, 56. The manuscript is located in *The Wroblewski Library of the Lithuanian Academy of Sciences*, Manuscript Department, fund nos. 16–24, p. 56.

48 I give heartfelt thanks to my colleague Edmundas Rimša for calling my attention to this source and for offering his insights on the matter.

49 The document is published in "Potwierdzenie unii między narody polskiemi i litewskimi, na sejmie walnym lubelskim roku 1569 skończoney [August 11]," *Volumina constitutionum*, part 2: *1550–1609*, vol. 1: *1550–1585*, ed. Stanisław Grodziski, Irena Dwornicka, and Wacław Uruszczak (Warsaw: Wydawnictwo Sejmowe, 2005), 243–244.

Polish King and Lithuanian Grand Duke Sigismund Augustus, to ratify the two states' unification agreement. The new state was called a *Rzeczypospolita*, a Polish word that translates as *republic* in English but had several meanings in the political language of the sixteenth century. One of these meanings denotes a state. In modern political usage, however, the word *republic* connotes first and foremost not the state but the republican form of running a state, which was not meant in the documents of the 1569 Lublin Sejm. Until the nineteenth century, the term "republic" was considered the equivalent of a "legal state." However, one should not dismiss the possibility that the architects of the 1569 Union of Lublin chose "Rzeczypospolita" to describe the state because they, like others at the time, adhered to the sixteenth-century concepts of the Kingdom of Poland's political thought, the roots of which were in the texts of Cicero. The Latin term *res publica*, whence Rzeczypospolita, can denote a legal state, which should be understood as a free political society; a *civitas libera*; or a mixture of monarchial, aristocratic, and democratic elements—a *res publica mixta*.[50]

The word "Rzeczypospolita" was invoked in the title of the new state in the first introductory article to the constitution that the Lublin Sejm put forward on the same date.[51] This instrument describes the newly created structure in legal jargon and discusses several elements of its structure and functioning. In its Section 5, however, it is declared in Sigismund Augustus's name that Livonia, which belonged to the Polish Crown and the Grand Duchy of Lithuania and whose representatives in the Sejm had taken an oath to the King of Poland and the Crown (*Krolowi Polskiemu i Koronie* in the original), would belong to these states as one state (*Rzeczypospolitej* in the original), which would tend to its defense and other issues exactly as its other states did. The decision on all other questions would be postponed to a future Sejm.[52]

---

50 See Dorota Pietrzyk-Reeves, "O pojęciu *Rzeczpospolita* (*res publica*) w polskiej myśli politycznej XVI wieku," *Czasopismo Prawno-Historyczne* 62, no. 1 (2010): 37–64.

51 "Zygmunt August z łaski Bożej Krol Polski, Wielkie Książę Litewskie, ruski, pruski, mazowiecki, żmudzki etc. pan i dziedzic. Wszem wobec i każdemu z osobna oznaczamy i wiadomo czynimy, iż czyniąc dosyć prośbam i żądliwościam wszech stanow koronnych, jako i samej potrzebie Rzeczypospolitej, także powinności a urzędowi Naszemu Krolewskiemu, abyśmy unią Wielkiego Księstwa Litewskiego z Koroną Polską, przez pradziada Naszego i wszystkie inne stany tych państw uczynioną i potym przez inne przodki Nasze, także i ich samych utwierdzoną i umocnioną, ku takiemu końcowi i skutkowi przywiedli iakoby nigdy niczym ani się naruszać, ani nigdy rozrywać nie mogła...," "Konstytucje sejmu Koronnego Lubelskiego Obojga Narodu uniowanego, Polskiego i Litewskiego, roku 1569 [August 11]," *Volumina Constitutionum*, part 2, vol. 1, 245.

52 "Ziemia Inflancka, na ktorej też nie mniej Koronie Polskiej iako i Wielkiemu Księstwu Litewskiemu należy ... przy tych państwach iako iuż przy iednej Rzeczypospolitej onę

Examining the complex issue surrounding the name of the new state, Wisner shows that the during the first decades after the passage of the Union of Lublin in 1569, attempts were made to call this state of two nations, Poles and Lithuanians, the Crown (*Korona*) or the Polish Crown (*Korona Polska*). Those who wished to do this, however, ran up against a Lithuanian society that had a strong sense of separate statehood. This, according to Wisner, is the most important reason for the disappearance of the terms "Korona Polska" or "Korona" from Sejm documents between the end of the sixteenth century and the first half of the seventeenth. Instead of these, the expression *Rzeczypospolita Korony Polskiej i Wielkiego Księstwa Litewskiego*[53]—the State of the Crown of Poland and the Grand Duchy of Lithuania—came into vogue in reference to the new political body.

A content analysis of the August 11, 1569 constitution shows that one cannot speak of consistency in referencing the name of the new entity and describing its structure. Neither Sigismund Augustus nor the first joint Sejms of the Commonwealth, which he called in 1570 and 1572, were able to achieve this. Historiography remains stuck with this outcome. To this day, there have been multiple descriptions of the state that was created in 1569, its form of rule, and its structure—a monarchy, a *respublica mixta*, a monarchy without a monarch, a federation, a boyar democracy, and a magnate oligarchy, among other permutations. Even in the most recent studies, historians understand the political body created by the 1569 Lublin Sejm in different ways, depending on sundry traditions that have developed in the historiography of the subject.

Some understand this political body as having existed as a unified state from its inception and examine the changes that occurred without differentiating between the Kingdom of Poland and the Grand Duchy of Lithuania.[54] Others, seeing and examining the differences between the states behind this creation and

---

zupełnie zachowywamy, także i obroną spolną iako i inne państwa Nasze opatrowana być ma. Już rady inflantckie i od innych stanow posłowie, ktorzy tu przysłani są stamtąd, Nam Krolowi Polskiemu i Koronie przysięgę uczynili. A dalszą sprawę i to co by do tego należało, na przyszły sejm koronny odkładamy, ktory od wszech stanow tam stąd tu posłowie z zupełną mocą przysłani być mają," ibid., 246.

53 Henryk Wisner, *Rzeczpospolita Wazów*, vol. 1: *Czasy Zygmunta III i Władysława IV* (Warsaw: Neriton, 2002), 10–14.

54 For the most recent works on the issue, see Wacław Uruszczak, "Zasady ustrojowe *Rzeczypospolitej* Obojga Narodów," in *Społeczeństwo a władza. Ustrój, prawo, idee*, ed. Jacek Przygodzki and Marian J. Ptak (Wrocław: Kolonia, 2010), 23–50; Ewa Dubas-Urwanowicz, *O nowy kształt Rzeczypospolitej. Kryzyz polityczny w państwie w latach 1576–1586* (Warsaw: DiG, 2013).

their societies, clarify the special aspects of the development of each.[55] Mariusz Markiewicz offers a noteworthy solution to this problem by suggesting the importance of remembering that the Commonwealth of the Two Nations was a border state. This state accommodated the traditions of three states that had been founded in the Middle Ages: the Kingdom of Poland, the Grand Duchy of Lithuania, and the state of the Teutonic Order. Each brought its own unique political traditions, institutions, and brand of political culture to the new entity. The intertwining of their traditions, plus those of others in the Commonwealth, created a fascinating political structure. The heritage of the Kingdom of Poland was instilled by the strong political position of the boyar class. A local self-governing structure of boyars and a legal procedure connected to it had already begun to form in the fourteenth century. Unlike those in the Kingdom of Poland, magnates in the GDL wielded much power and were set apart from the average boyar by their privileges. The GDL's boyar class had not developed a spirit of resistance that would be determined by traditions other than those of Polish society; it also lacked experience in making and implementing its own decisions. Those who witnessed the creation of the Commonwealth understood very well that its inhabitants were not united by joint interests and did not fear the same enemies, which is why some did not understand the others' defense needs. When the inhabitants of the eastern lands came under the threat of attack, the inhabitants of the western Polish land of Pomerania took no interest in the crisis and were loath to burden themselves with the duty of defending this faraway palatinate. Such examples are numerous. According to Markiewicz, such a state could exist only if agreements were honored and the law commanded a consensus.[56]

Neither Sigismund Augustus nor politicians and lawyers from Poland and Lithuania gifted the newly created state with a unified body of codified written law. The only written content in the Lublin Sejm constitution of September 11, 1569 that addresses the issue states that the GDL law should be harmonized with the law of the Kingdom of Poland, that a commission for the purpose should be formed, and that the matter should be carried out in a certain way.[57]

---

55   For the most recent works on the topic, see Wisner, *Rzeczpospolita Wazów*, vol. 3; Kuolys, *Res Lituana*; Zakrzewski, *Wielkie Księstwo Litewskie*.

56   Mariusz Markiewicz, "'Jedyna i nieporównywalna?'—normalne państwo europejskie czy może państwo pogranicza?," in *Między Zachodem a Wschodem. Studia z dziejów Rzeczypospolitej w epoce Nowożytnej*, ed. Jacek Staszewski, Krzysztof Mikulski, and Jarosław Dumanowski (Toruń: Adam Marszalek, 2002), 19–22.

57   "Za prośbą wszystkich stanow Wielkiego Księstwa Litewskiego naznaczamy i deputujemy, za ichże spolnym zazwoleniem, na poprawę statutu tegoż Wielkiego Księstwa Litewskiego pewne osoby, to iest z rady Jego Miłość księdza Waleryana biskupa

The commission was composed so as to include two members of the GDL's Council of Lords, one representatives from each palatinate, and the law expert Augustinas Rotundus, who had participated in drafting the Lithuanian Statute. The members were instructed to review the "statute of Poland" and harmonize Lithuania's legal norms with it. The constitution put forward by the Sejm, however, did not identify the specific statute of Poland on which the panel was to base its work.

The commission failed to complete its task in time for the next Sejm. Neither was a unified legal codex for the Commonwealth compiled before Sigismund Augustus's death in 1572. A document was drawn up for the election of the first ruler who would not stem from the Jagiellonian dynasty—Henry of Valois, as it turned out. This document, which came to be known as the Henrician Articles of 1573, included a demand for corrections to the existing Lithuanian legal code (that is, the Second Lithuanian Statute of 1566) ahead of the coronation of the new ruler. The need to amend Lithuanian law was not expressed as a demand as such in the document; it was more a recommendation that a consensus be formed and legislative amendments be made, acknowledging as fact that the 1566 Second Lithuanian Statue was the law in force.

According to one of the 1573 Henrician Articles, the calling of a general Sejm should be preceded by sejmiks convened in accordance with prevailing

---

wileńskiego i Malchera Semota kasztellana żmudzkiego, przy ktorych i sekretarza Naszego doktora Augustyna, wojta wileńskiego. A gdzieby ktory z tych prze słuszną przyczynę być nie mogł, tedy na iego miejsce innego deputować będziemy. A z stanu szlacheckiego każdego woiewodztwa po iednemu, to iest z Woiewodztwa Wileńskiego i Trockiego urodzonych Mikołaja Dorohostajskiego, stolnika Naszego Wielkiego Księstwa Litewskiego i dzierżawcę wieluńskiego, tywonia gondzinskiego, a księdza Łukasza Swierskiego, marszałka Naszego Ziemie Żmudzkiej, Jana Steckowica z Woiewodztwa Nowogrodzkiego, Benedykta Jurachę marszałka Naszego. A z ziemie Połockiej księdza Pawła Sokolińskiego, podkomorzego witebskiego. Z Woiewodztwa Witebskiego Jana Skołkę. Z Woiewodztwa Brzeskiego Kierdeja Kryczewskiego, sędziego brzeskiego. Z Woiewodztwa Mścisławskiego, Siedleckiego. Z Woiewodztwa Mińskiego Marcina Wołoczkiewicza. A dla pisania przy tychże deputaciech naznaczmy dwu pisarzow ziemskich: Andrzeja Maczkowicza wileńskiego, Piotra Stanisławowicza ośmińskiego. Miejsce Wilno, czas święto świętego Marcina w roku ku zjechaniu terażniejszym [November 11, 1569] i wykonaniu tej sprawy im naznaczony. Przy ktorej poprawie ci to deputaci statut polski mają przd się wziąć, a co najbliżej z nim prawa litewskie zgadzać, aby już we wszystkich państwach Naszych, iako w iednej Rzeczypospolitej jednaka a nieodwłoczna sprawiedliwość ludziom iść mogła. A tę poprawę oni do Nas na sejm walny blisko przyszły będą winni odnieść," in "Konstytucyje Sejmu Koronnego Lubelskiego Obojga Narodu Uniowanego, Polskiego i Litewskiego [August 11, 1569]," *Volumina Constitutionum*, part 2, vol. 1, 254–255.

customs in the Kingdom of Poland and the Statute in the GDL.[58] In another article, it is indicated that the members of the GDL's Council of Lords, just like those of Volhynia, Kyiv, and other lands where Lithuanian law was in force, and all classes had to attain a consensus and amend the law before the coronational Sejm. The document also gave them latitude to make corrections to their own law and judicial procedure in the future.[59]

Henry de Valois was the first ruler of the Commonwealth to swear by agreement *pacta conventa*. *Pacta conventa* was a contractual agreement, from 1573 to 1764 entered into between the political nation of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth and a newly elected king upon his election to throne. The document was drawn up by the Sejm. *Pacta conventa* confirmed the king's commitment to respect Commonwealth laws. The new ruler had to swear that he would observe them. In future, the ruler was only to be elected and was not allowed to choose a successor.

Soon after, Henry of Valois learned about the death of his brother, the king of France Charles IX, he left the Commonwealth in mid-June 1574 and headed back to France. But Henry did not leave the Polish throne formally. His absence provoked a constitutional crisis, in the middle of which, a congress of senators and boyars from the Vilnius Palatinate was called on August 10, 1574, in Lithuania. It issued a political statement of confidence in Valois on the basis of the 1566 Second Lithuanian Statute. The GDL senators and nobles took the responsibility for the maintenance of domestic order, the organization of work in the courts, and defense against external enemies.[60]

Henry stayed in France and was crowned King there on February 13, 1575. The Parliament of the Commmonwealth attempted to resolve the crisis

---

58 "[9] Sejm walny koronny we dwie liecie nadali ma być składan.... A przed takowymi sejmy w Polszcze wedle zwyczjow ich, a w Litwie wedle statutu Wielkiego Księstwa Litewskiego sejmiki powiatowe być mają, iako w Kole i w Korczynie sejmik głowny bywa, także w Litwie w Wołkowysku głowny sejmik być ma...," ibid., 328.

59 "[16] ...Tak też panowie rady, wszystkie stany Wielkiego Księstwa Litewskiego i ziem wołyńskich, kijowskich, bracławskich, ktore się prawem litewskim sądzą, tę tymże sposobem postanowili, iż do sejmu przyszłego na koronacyją Naszą złożonego praw swoich poprawić i obyczj sprawiedliwości między sobą postanowić maią. A iako oni między sobą postanowią i na co się większa Part tych, ktorzy się prawem pospolitym sądzą zgodzą, to My wszytko przy koronacyjej Naszy poprzysiąc powinni będziemy i na potym także praw swych i sądow poprawować im zawżdy wolno będzie," ibid.

60 "Zjazd senatorów i szlachty (sejmik) wojewodztwa wileńskiego w Wilnie (August 10–11, 1574)," in *Akta zjazdów stanów Wielkiego Księstwa Litewskiego*, vol. 1: *Okresy bezkrólewi (1572–1586, 1586–1587, 1632, 1648, 1696–1697, 1706–1709, 1733–1735, 1763–1764)*, ed. Henryk Lulewicz (Warsaw: Neriton, 2006), 94–98.

by notifying Henry that his Polish throne would be lost if he did not return from France by May 12, 1575. Henry's failure to return caused the Parliament to declare his throne vacant.

After an interregnum, Stephen Báthory was elected as the new Commonwealth ruler. Báthory was accepted coldly at first, before he gave promises of political concessions. During his reign (1576–1586) GDL continued to loosen itself from the restrictions imposed on it by the acts of the Union of Lublin. Seeking to achieve independency from the noblemen, Báthory exploited GDL-Polish disputes. When Báthory failed to reach his goals in the Commonwealth Sejm, he called together the GDL convocation, the informal successor of the GDL Seimas, which had been abolished by the union of Lublin (1569). Báthory did not surrender to the pressure of the Polish nobility, as he could count on the Lithuanian support after his victory against Moscow.[61]

The harmonization of the GDL law with the legal code of the Kingdom of Poland recurred in various shapes in the political space of the Commonwealth but was not implemented during the Báthory's rule.[62] On the contrary, this period saw intensive efforts to augment and amend the articles of the Second Lithuanian Statute. The meetings of the GDL's classes discussed the results of these exertions.

For example, only one question was discussed at the 1584 congress in Vilnius: amendments to and a new redaction of the Lithuanian Statute. Congress participants, senators, and district envoys listened to and discussed the proposed redactions. They labored for several months and even then some articles were left undecided upon. They were written down and presented to the Commonwealth's leader with the request to include them in the pre-Sejm instruction of the king, which was sent to all districts of the GDL.[63] The

---

61 About the reign of the first elective rulers of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth more see Almut Bues, "The Formation of the Polish-Lithuanian Monarchy in the Sixteenth Century," in *The Polish-Lithuanian Monarchy in European Context, c. 1500–1795*, ed. Richard Butterwick (London: Palgrave, 2001) 58-81; Felicia Roşu, *Elective Monarchy in Transylvania and Poland-Lithuania, 1569–1587* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2017); Jacek Jędruch, *Constitution, Elections, and Legislature of Poland, 1493–1977* (Washington, D.C.: University Press of America, 1982).

62 Anna Karabowicz, "Współdziałanie króla i stanów w tworzeniu prawa za panowania Stefana Batorego," in Przygodzki and Ptak, *Społeczeństwo a władza. Ustrój, prawo, idee*, 239–251.

63 "Zjazd stanów WKsL planowany pierwotnie October 20, 1583, który odbył się w innym terminie (January 23–late March [24?], 1584)," in *Akta zjazdów stanów Wielkiego Księstwa Litewskiego*, vol. 2, 73–77.

congress delegates, representing the entire political nation, resolved that the boyars of the districts themselves should discuss and decide on how to formulate the controversial articles[64] for the updated Lithuanian Statute. On March 25, 1584 the GDL chancellery issued a universal, an official document presented on behalf of the Stephen Báthory, confirming that proposed corrections to the Statute would be sent to the districts for consideration in advance of the Sejm. Báthory also promised to adopt the new Lithuanian Statute at the Sejm once it was fully redacted.[65] He did not keep his word in his last Sejm, that of 1585, where the attention was focused on discussing complex foreign-policy issues.[66] The new Lithuanian Statute was finally adopted by the newly chosen Polish King and Lithuanian Grand Duke Sigismund III Vasa at his coronation Sejm in 1588.

The idea of harmonizing the law in force in the Commonwealth was not implemented. The Kingdom of Poland and the Grand Duchy of Lithuania, although comprising a joint state, continued to follow different legal codes and had separate tribunals. The Lithuanian Tribunal, founded in 1581, carried out more than court functions. Its sessions, held in Vilnius and Navahrudak, were venues of informal political forums due to the numerous magnates and boyars who often attended them.[67] It was there that questions relevant to the political community were discussed and decisions were formulated.

For example, GDL senators and boyars, congressing during the work of the tribunal in Navahrudak on September 25, 1596, debated complex issues related to the reform of the Orthodox Church. A document/instruction representing all central and local government officials was prepared for the envoys who were en route to the Brest Synod.[68] After the beginning of the Rokosz of

---

64 Lappo, *1588 metų Lietuvos Statutas*, vol. 1: 313–473.

65 "Universal Stefana Batorego do powiatów prezentujący uchwały zjazdu (wersja skierowana do powiatu słonimskiego)," Wilno, March 25, 1584, *Akta zjazdów Wielkiego Księstwa Litewskiego*, vol. 2, 78.

66 The aims and efforts to update the Lithuanian Statute and their results during the rule of Stephen Báthory (1576–1586) are discussed in ibid., 343–353; and Karabowicz, "Współdziałanie króla."

67 H. Lulewicz, "Wstęp," in *Akta zjazdów stanów Wielkiego Księstwa Litewskiego*, vol. 2, 16.

68 "My rady, vradniki zemskie rycerstvo shliakhta obyvateli Velikogo Kniazstva [s] Litovskogo oznaimuem, izh˝ kgdy esmo sezde do Novagorodka dlia sprav sudovykh golovnykh nalezhachykh z˝ekhalise...," "List-instrukcja zjazdu dana poslom na synod brzeski, Nowogródek, September 25, 1596," Zjazd senatorsko-szlachecki na bazie Trybunalu WKsL w Nowogródku (September 25, 1596), *Akta zjazdów stanów Wielkiego Księstwa Litewskiego*, vol. 2, 127.

Sandomierz[69] in the Kingdom of Poland in 1606–1607 (see below), the issues that had arisen were discussed at the seat of the Lithuanian tribunal, with an address prepared for the rebels.[70]

In the most recent studies, it is observed that the idea of creating a common statute for the Crown and Lithuania weakened at the turn of the seventeenth century and enjoyed no support from either the Crown or the boyars of the GDL.[71] From the perspective of political culture, one should seek the reasons for this in the political law of the Kingdom of Poland and the Grand Duchy of Lithuania. These reasons, once discovered, lay bare the spirit of the law as maintained by the political nations that had created the composite state, those of Poland and Lithuania.[72] Such research can be done by means of partial comparative analysis.[73]

For a comparison, I have chosen texts by legal experts and creators of legal codexes—Jan Herburt (1570),[74] Stanisław Sarnicki (1594),[75] and Jan

---

69 For more on the Rokosz of Sandomierz and the GDL's reaction to it, see H. Wisner, "Litwa wobec rokoszu (1606–1607)," *Kwartalnik Historyczny* LXXIX, no. 2 (1972): 278–299.

70 Material on the congresses is published in *Akta zjazdów stanów Wielkiego Księstwa Litewskiego*, vol. 2, 153–155, 161–165, 176–178.

71 These questions are examined in greater depth in A. Moniuszko, "III Statut a próby kodyfikacji prawa koronnego za panowania Zygmunta III," in *Lietuvos Statutas ir Lietuvos Didžiosios Kunigaikštystės bajoriškoji visuomenė*, ed. Irena Valikonytė ir Lirija Steponavičienė (Vilnius: Vilniaus universiteto leidykla, 2015), 63–74, and A. B. Zakrzewski, "Naiwność czy taktyka? Uzasadnianie prób unifikacji prawa litewskiego i koronnego XVI–XVIII wieku," ibid., 75–83.

72 The term "political law," as noted and explained by A. B. Zakrzewski, demonstrates the partitioning of law into court law and political law from the sixteenth century onward. The dichotomy is explained by the tradition in Roman law of keeping private law and public law separate. Basing himself on texts by Augustinus Rotundus, Andreas Volanus, and Leon Sapieha, Zakrzewski claims that political (public) law formed the understanding of the dominance of law in the GDL's boyar community starting in the first half of the sixteenth century.

73 The legal historian Juliusz Bardach, an expert on Grand Duchy and Commonwealth law, explains the terms "a comparative analysis of state and law" and "partial comparative analysis" and the reasoning behind their use in his historical research in his article "Metoda porównawcza w zastosowaniu do powszechnej historii państwa i prawa," in his *Themis a Clio czyli prawo a historia* (Warsaw: Liber, 2001), 99–146.

74 J. Herburt, *Statuta y Przywileje Koronne z łacińskiego języka na polskie przełożone, nowym porządkiem zebrane y spisane* (Kraków: M. Szaffenberg, 1570). The copy of the legal code used here is kept in the Rare Books Department of the *Wróblewski* Library of the Lithuanian Academy of Sciences, syg. XVI/2–33.

75 S. Sarnicki, *Statuta i Metryka przywilejów Koronnych* (Kraków: Drukarnia Łazarzowa, 1594). The copy of the legal code used here is kept in the Rare Books Department of the *Wróblewski* Library of the Lithuanian Academy of Sciences, syg. 2—L–16/2–31.

Januszowski (1600)[76]—plus the texts of the Lithuanian Statute.[77] Employing the method of comparative law, I make a first-ever attempt to peruse the legal codexes of the Kingdom of Poland and the Grand Duchy of Lithuania from the second half of the sixteenth century in order to determine out how the 1413 Treaty of Horodło was used in the process of codifying the law.[78] To carry out the comparison, I chose materials that may seem somewhat dissimilar (three Polish legal codexes and one Lithuanian codex) and were greatly impacted by the different codifications of the law in the sixteenth century and their outcomes.

The foundations of the political spirit of written law in the Kingdom of Poland were laid out in the 1506 legal code, which is known as the 1506 "Statue of Łaski." Researchers agree that this text did not thoroughly systematize legal norms. It was the first time, however, that such a large amount of legal material was collected in one document. Once it was printed up, it gave society a chance to acquaint itself with texts that were unfamiliar even to broader layers of the boyar class to that time. The Kingdom of Poland's legal codex (*Corpus iuris Regni Poloniae*) covered public (political) law and regulated the workings of the courts.[79] The spirit of Poland's political law is best shown in this legal codex by the four acts of union between the Kingdom of Poland and Grand Duchy of Lithuania (1401, 1413, 1438, and 1499) that the code includes and that it endows with the status of legal acts.

No forum, however, managed to bring about a codified set of laws in one legal codex in the Kingdom of Poland either before the creation of the

---

76   J. Januszowski, *Statuta Prawa i Constitucie Koronne łacińskie y polskie z Statutów Łaskiego y Herborta y z Constituciy Koronnych zebrane, y na ksiąg dziesięcioro, części, tytuły, prawa i paragraphy ... spisane, sporządzone y wydane* (Kraków: Drukarnia Łazarzowa, 1600). The copy of the legal code used here is kept in the Rare Books Department of the *Wróblewski* Library of the Lithuanian Academy of Sciences, syg. XVI/2–38/1.

77   The publication used is Lappo, *1588 metų Lietuvos Statutas*, vol. 2: *Tekstas* (Kaunas: Akc "Spindulio" B-ves spaustuvė, 1938).

78   See J. Kiaupienė, "1413 m. Horodlės dokumentų panaudojimas Lenkijos Karalystės teisės kodifikavimo procese XVI a.," in *Jogailos ir Vytauto laikai*, ed. Zigmantas Kiaupa (Kaunas: *Vytauto* Didžiojo universitetas, 2011), 97–116; eadem, "1413 m. Horodlės dokumentų 'gyvenimai'" / "Istnienie i funkcionowaie dokumentów Horodelskich z 1413 r.," in *1413 m. Horodlės aktai*, 264–276 and 299–312.

79   S. Płaza, *Historia prawa w Polsce na tle porównawczym*, vol. 1: *X-XVIII w.* (Kraków: Księgarnia Akademicka, 2002), 17; W. Uruszczak, "Commune incliti Poloniae Regni privilegium constitutionum et indultum. O tytule i mocy prawnej Statutu Łaskiego z 1506 roku," in *Prace Instytutu prawa własności intelektualnej UJ 96: Prace poświęcone pamięci Adama Uruszczaka* (2006): 131.

Commonwealth in 1569 or in the second half of the sixteenth century. The Polish Sejms established commissions to draft a single statute in Polish that would be adopted and ratified as the sole valid legal codex in the Kingdom, but no such statute was formulated. The initiative for preparing new legal codexes belonged to private individuals.[80] It was a tough road for the adoption of legal codexes, and their discussion and approval in the Sejms faltered with regularity. The printed legal codexes, however, were widely disseminated in Poland's boyar society and their spirit had a great impact on the political culture there. Stanisław Grodziski calls the legal codexes compiled, printed, and used by Herburt (the Latin version in 1563 and the Polish translation in 1570) the tie that links Łaski's Statute to the needs dictated by Polish public life in the second half of the sixteenth century. They formed the basis on which subsequent codifiers of Polish law would build.[81]

Herburt's 1570 legal codex is comprised of three parts that he called books. Political law is dealt with in the third book, titled "Privileges." The book includes privileges of the Polish Crown and other texts in a general section called "O ziednoczeniu Księstw" [About the unification of the duchies]. The first chapter is titled "Przywileie Księstw Koronie Polskiey podległych: jako Księstwa Litewskiego, Ruskiego, Pruskiego, Oswięcimskiego, Zatorskiego, y Kiiowskiego" [Privileges of the Duchies subordinate to the Crown of Poland—Lithuania, Rus', Prussia, Oswięcim, Zator, and Kyiv]. It begins with two introductory texts: "Około ziednoczenia Księstw z Koroną" [On the unification of the Duchies with the Crown] and "Podobnasz temu Ustawa" [Similar provisions]. These texts explain the benefits of unification.[82] The texts lay out the advantages of unifying the duchies with the Kingdom of Poland and creating one state, emphasizing that a united force is always stronger and better able to fend off enemies than a divided one. Farther on, Herburt discusses the four aforementioned fifteenth-century Polish-Lithuanian union documents that were incorporated into the 1506 Łaski's Statute.[83] As for new information, he inserts a text titled "Deklaracia o Uniej Litewskiej" [Declarations about union

---

80 A. Moniuszko, "Projekty korektury ziemskiego prawa koronnego Jana Januszowskiego—polityczne uwarunkowania niepowodzenia / Jan Januszowski's draft amendments of the crown's land law: political circumstances of the failure / Entwürfe der Korrektur des königlichen Landrechts von Jan Januszowski—politische Bedingtheiten des Misserfolgs," *Studia z dziejów państwa i prawa polskiego* 16 (2013): 61.

81 S. Grodziski, "Wstęp," in *Volumina constitutionum*, part 1, vol. 1, 10.

82 Herburt, *Statuta y Przywileje Koronne*, 655–656.

83 Ibid., 656–670.

with Lithuania] issued by the King of Poland and the Lithuanian Grand Duke Sigismund Augustus on March 13, 1564, and a decision by the Crown's Sejm in Warsaw (1563) concerning unification with Lithuania, titled "Reces Seymu Koronnego Warszawskiego 1563 w sprawie około Uniey Litewskiey" [1563 decision of the Polish Crown Warsaw Sejm on the union with Lithuania]. He also included two documents that the 1569 Lublin Sejm had adopted and ratified concerning union with Lithuania, on the basis of which the Commonwealth of the Two Nations was founded: "Przywiley około Uniey Wielkiego Księstwa Litewskiego z Koroną na walnym Seymie Lubelskim od Panów Rad Duchowych y Swieckich y Posłów Ziemskich Roku Pańskiego 1569 uchwalony" [The privilege of Union, adopted by Parliament in 1569 in Lublin and "Potwierdzenie Uniey miedzy Narody Polskim y Litewskimi na Seymie walnym Lubelskim Roku P. 1569 skończonego" [Approval of the Union of Nations of Poland and Lithuania in 1569 Sejm in Lublin].[84] These unification documents, along with the glosses in the margins that supplemented them and guided the users of this legal codex, solidified the belief among Poland's political community that the Grand Duchy of Lithuania had been joined to the Kingdom of Poland since the beginning of the fifteenth century and remained such after the creation of the Commonwealth of the Two Nations. The introductory texts of the "Privileges" chapter in Herburt's 1570 legal codex, the four fifteenth-century Polish-Lithuanian unification texts, and the acts of the 1569 Union of Lublin were used to present political law in Sarnicki's and Januszowski's legal codices.[85]

The legal codices of the Kingdom of Poland bear witness to the fact that during the Commonwealth's first period of existence, political law spread and solidified the image of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania as having been incorporated into the Kingdom from the early fifteenth century onward in the consciousness of boyar society, the legal and political culture, and in historical memory. This promoted the belief that one could speak of the Kingdom of

---

84 Ibid., 670–695.

85 "Wielkiego X. Litewskiego Przywileie, z iego Powiatow, miast, z strony Elekciiey, Seymow spolnych, dostoienstw, praerogatiw, symmachtias, to iest spolnego wotowania y pomocy, foedera, monety, telonia, omoclyrias, to iest indifferentis dominii, tytułu, exekuciiey, Statutow ich, książęcych domow, imion y spadkow. O tych wszystkich rzeczach Przywileie te obmawiaią," in Sarnicki, *Statuta i Metryka*, 984; "Księgi siodme Księstw Koronnych, to iest Wielkiego X. Litewskiego, Ruskiego, Podolskiego, Bielskiey ziemie, Kiiowa, Wolynia, Braclawa, Drohickiey ziemie, Bielskiego powiatu, Księstwa Pruskiego, Mazowieckiego, Inflantckiego, Kurlandzkiego, Oswięcimskiego y Zatorskiego. Częsc pierwsza o Wielkim X. Litewskim," in Januszowski, *Statuta Prawa i Constitucie Koronne*, 741–789.

Poland and the Commonwealth of the Two Nations as synonyms and consider the Grand Duchy of Lithuania just one of its provinces.

The authors of the Lithuanian Statutes chose a different way of conveying the spirit of political law than that taken by Polish lawyers. Political law was not given a separate section in the Statutes. Contrary to the legal codices of Poland that were agreed upon in the sixteenth century, the Statutes have no paragraphs on privileges. They also lack historical preambles that would describe the union ties between the Grand Duchy of Lithuania and the Kingdom of Poland in the past and present. Neither a single document nor even a section of a document alludes to such ties. Political law was integrated into the relevant chapters of the Lithuanian Statutes, which discuss the state, its structure, the relationship between its ruler and society, and law and the organization of the courts, where one can find the fundamental concepts of sixteenth-century Lithuanian political law.

As for why the authors of the Lithuanian Statutes chose this method of outlining the state's political law, one comes across the idea, formulated in historiography, that the main reason was the aim to distance themselves from the interpretation of the union that appeared in Polish codices, which Lithuania's political community had been challenging since the fifteenth century. By not including or even mentioning the acts of union with Poland, Lithuanian lawyers denied the fifteenth- and sixteenth-century union documents the status of legal acts. Bardach quotes from a letter in which Chancellor Leon Sapieha of the GDL, who published the 1588 Statute, explains that he "did not include the privileges in the Statute text." Sapieha was only responsible for drafting the statute "because not all of them suit us. Some begin well while the middle section is poor; in others the middle section is good and the beginning or the end is unsuitable." In Bardach's opinion, Sapieha's position shows the views of Lithuania's political nation in the sixteenth century toward the bilateral relationship that the unification acts had created.[86] Reiterating and continuing this thought, Zakrzewski emphasizes that the main concern of the Lithuanian Statute is with court (processional) law, while political law is dealt with selectively.[87] I do not intend to discuss Zakrzewski's statement; I simply want to note that the method chosen by the codifiers to outline political law in the document does not change its spirit. This is proven by the political spirit of

---

86 Bardach, "Statuty Litewskie w ich kręgu prawno-kulturowym," 51.
87 Zakrzewski, *Wielkie Księstwo Litewskie*, 220–221.

the 1588 Lithuanian Statute, which declared the Grand Duchy of Lithuania an independent state that has its own laws.

The spirit of political law in the 1588 Lithuanian Statute is perhaps best expressed in the third chapter of the Statute, titled "O vol′nostiakh shliakhetskikh i o rozmnozhen′iu Velikogo Kniazstva Litov″skogo" [On the freedoms of the boyars and expansion of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania]. In the first article, "o rozmnozhen′iu Velikogo Kniazstva Litov″skogo" [On the expansion of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania], Sigismund III Vasa, as the Lithuanian Grand Duke, swears in the name of his descendants, the grand dukes of Lithuania, to honor, preserve, defend, and expand the Grand Duchy and never to degrade his glorious state, the dukes, the lords of the council, clergy and laymen, as well as all officials, boyars, knights, and all other classes.[88] This primary concept of political law is repeated in other chapters of the Statute.

In terms of political law, the 1588 Lithuanian Statue is exceptional. It was drafted in final form, approved by the ruler, and went into force twenty years after the Commonwealth of the Two Nations was formed in 1569. However, it affirms the existence of the sovereign state of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania and enshrines its domestic policy and foreign relations in a set of laws. It marks the introduction of the laws of the GDL. It does not address itself to the changes that had occurred since 1569, even overlooking the establishment of the Commonwealth. The latter event is mentioned only in the privilege of January 28, 1588, by Polish King and Lithuanian Grand Duke Sigismund III Vasa, in which the Statute was approved. The privilege indicates that the Statute pertains to the Grand Duchy of Lithuania and is to be printed and sent to the districts in Polish and Ruthenian. The privilege also emphasizes that the

---

88 "My gospodar obetsuem tezh i shliubuem to za sebe i za potomki nashi, velikie kniazi Litovskie, pod toiu zh prisegoiu nashoiu, kotoruiu esmo uchinili vsim obyvatelem vsikh zeml′ Velikogo Kniaz′stva Litovskogo, izh toe-to slavnoe panstvo Velikoe Kniazstvo i vsi zemli, ku nemu zdavna i teper nalezhachie, v slave, tytulekh, stolicy, zatsnosti, vladzy, mozhnosti, roskazyvan′iu i v inshikh vsiakikh nalezhnostiakh i prislukhvan′iu, i tezh v granitsakh, ni v chom umen′shivati i uimovati abo ponizhati ne maem i ovshem eshcho vsego togo primnozhati tsochem i budem; i khotia by Pan Bog, z laski Svoee svetoe, nam gospodaru uzychiti rachil pan′stva inogo, abo i korolevstva, togdy pred se sego panstva nashogo Velikogo Kniazstva Litobskogo kniazei panov—rad dukhovnykh i svet′skikh i vsikh vriadnikov zem″skikh i dvor″nykh, shliakhtu i ritserstva, i vsikh inykh stanov ni v chom ne ponizhati, ale ot vsiakoe legkosti i ponizhen′ia sterechy i boroniti budem, s pomoch″iu Bozhoiu staraiuchi se o primnozhen′e i vyvyshen′e togo pan′stva i vsikh dostoinostei, ozdob i pozhitkov, z nabolshoiu pilnost′iu i usilovan′em nashim," Lappo, *1588 metų Lietuvos Statutas*, vol. 2, *Tekstas*, 117.

new and amended Statute of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania contains nothing that would contradict or undermine the new unification agreement.[89]

Assessing this situation, I can only reiterate Bardach's remark that the Statute did not declare the dissolution of the 1569 Union of Lublin.[90] However, one should bear in mind that this was a legal codex for one constituent of the composite state of the Commonwealth, the Grand Duchy of Lithuania. The 1588 Lithuanian Statute declared the Lithuanian state's sovereignty and demonstrated distancing from the legal codices of the other states of the Commonwealth. In this sense, the political spirit of the Lithuanian Statute clashed with the assertion in the 1569 Union of Lublin that "The Kingdom of Poland and the Grand Duchy of Lithuania are now a single inseparable and united body."

The Lithuanian Statute was the work of a political nation of the early modern period, the guardian of the Lithuanian state's political and legal spirit, and so it remained until the Commonwealth expired. Researchers of the Statute and publishers of its texts emphasize the importance of this legal codex in the hierarchy of values of the GDL's boyar society. When the concept of the state as the guardian of the boyars' freedoms took hold, it was understood that the state would defend these freedoms "through" the Statute. The boyars valued the Statute not only as a legal code but as the most important guarantee of their freedoms.[91]

A comparison of the sixteenth-century legal codices of the GDL and the Kingdom of Poland elicits several questions. Was Lithuania's political nation really fragmented politically in the sixteenth century? Had the middle and petty boyar classes of the GDL already fully adopted the political attitudes of society as had been shaped by the laws of the Kingdom of Poland by the time the Union of Lublin was created? If the answer to these questions is yes, it is hard to imagine that such a conflicted political nation could attain sufficient maturity to draft three legal codices in the sixteenth century and live according

---

89 "...Ved´ zhe tot Statut novopravlenyi zvia″kom i spisom Unii ni v chom protiven byti i nichogo shkoditi i ublizhati ne maet´," ibid., 8.

90 This particular legal question is discussed in greater detail in Bardach, "Statuty Litewskie," 54–55.

91 See S. Lazutka, *Lietuvos Statutai, jų kūrėjai ir epocha* (Kaunas: Spindulys, 1994); I. Valikonytė, "Konstitucijos link. Lietuvos Statutas bajoriškos visuomenės vertybių hierarchijoje," in *Mūsų konstitucionalizmo raida*, ed. A. V. Bartkutė and A. Vaišnys (Vilnius: Valstybės žinios, 2003), 6–19; E. Gudavičius and I. Valikonytė, "Pirmojo Lietuvos Statuto vieta valstybės ir teisės istorijoje," 23–28.

to the system and spirit of rule of a sovereign Lithuania. Historians, however, still insist repeatedly that it is so.

Evidence from life, it has been argued, shows that the aim to implement the decision of the 1569 Lublin Sejm and harmonize the law of the Kingdom of Poland with that of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania was not carried out because the two sixteenth-century political nations, Poland's and Lithuania's, had different traditions of the spirit of political law. I challenge this argument. The 1529 and 1566 Lithuanian Statutes carried out an important task in bringing together and cultivating the GDL's political nation. The 1588 Lithuanian Statute demarcated the border within the Republic that had been created in 1569 and divided the composite state into two zones of political culture. In one of them, the Kingdom of Poland, there was a belief, instilled in the political nation since the time of Łaski's Statute, that the Grand Duchy of Lithuania had been incorporated into Poland back during the reign of Jogaila and Vytautas. GDL boyars emerged as a political nation that believed in the sovereignty of its state and strengthened and defended it with legal tools both before the Union of Lublin and during the initial Commonwealth period.

3 The Grand Duchy's Culture of Parliamentarism

The history of the GDL's parliamentary culture is told in a voluminous corpus of works and research.[1] The primary attention in research concerns the genesis and development of the sejm as an institution. Historians agree that the creation of a parliamentary institution is a long-term process that cannot be traced to a specific founding date. Never, they observe, has there been a case where a ruler decreed that "we" had founded a parliament that would henceforth carry out a specified function. In this respect, the Grand Duchy of Lithuania is no exception.

The roots of the future Lithuanian Sejm lay in the consilia (councils) of the Grand Duke. One still cannot, however, call these councils of rulers and nobles a sejm. It is difficult to ascertain how the nature of these councils changed through the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries. In the GDL, they were closed forums of political discussion that left no written sources. The appearance of European parliamentarism in this period is tied to the class elections that took place during the Late Middle Ages. The meetings of nobles that were called first in England and France and soon afterwards in other countries began

---

1 One can start investigating the history of GDL parliamentary culture by consulting classics in historiography that have not lost their relevance: Matei Liubavskii, *Litovsko-Russkii seim. Opyt po istorii uchrezhdeniia v sviazi s vnutrennim stroem i vneshneiu zhizn´iu gosudarstva* (Moscow: Universitetskaia tipografiia, 1900); Nikolai Maksimeiko, *Seimy Litovsko-russkago gosudarstva do Liublinskoi unii 1569 g.* (Khar´kov: Tipografiia A. Darre, 1902). Contemporary historiography is represented by the following: M. Jučas, "Lietuvos Didžiosios Kunigaikštystės parlamentarizmas," in *Lietuvos seimas*, ed. Violeta Motulaitė, Statys Venckevičius, Edvardas Gudavičius et al. (Vilnius: Kultūra, 1996), 79–112; A. Rachuba, *Wiekie Księstwo Litewskie w systemie parlamentarnym Rzeczypospolitej w latach 1569–1763* (Warsaw: Wydawnictwo Sejmowe, 2002). For a bibliography concerning issues related to the Sejms of the Kingdom of Poland and the Grand Duchy of Lithuania, see R. Kołodziej and M. Zwierzykowski, *Bibliografia parlamentaryzmu Rzeczypospolitej szlacheckiej* (Poznań: Wydawnictwo Poznańskie, 2012).

to evolve gradually into a political structure based on the principle of repre-
sentation. This tenet became entrenched both institutionally and legally and
expanded the nobles' right to influence their ruler's decisions, a principle that
took shape earlier in other European societies.[2]

Using research on meetings between classes in several European coun-
tries, the Lithuanian historian Rimvydas Petrauskas observes that the forma-
tion of the GDL's Sejm was not a consciously planned act but an evolutionary
outcome.[3] The Council of Lords that gathered around the Lithuanian Grand
Duke and emerged from the meetings of nobles during the Middle Ages,
Petrauskas states, may be interpreted only as a certain kind of political envi-
ronment in which the Sejm formed, one that itself changed throughout the
fifteenth century. Petrauskas concludes that although the meetings of nobles
during Casimir's stint as Polish King and Lithuanian Grand Duke changed

2 It is not possible to list all of the main research works on this topic. Thus, I call the readers'
   attention to the work of the International Commission for the History of Representative
   and Parliamentary Institutions (ICHRPI). The commission employs researchers on par-
   liamentarism in various European countries and organizes study and publication of the
   history of parliamentary institutions. See *Podział władzy i parlamentaryzm w przeszłości
   i współcześnie. Prawo, doktryna, praktyka. 500, rocznica konstytucji Nihil novi z 1505 r. 56.
   Konferencja Międzynarodowej Komisji Historii Instytucji Reprezentatywnych i Parlamentarnych
   w Krakowie i Radomiu (September 5–8, 2005). Prace przedstawione Międzynarodowej
   Komisji Historii Instytucji Reprezentatywnych i Parlamentarnych / Separation of Powers
   and Parliamentarism: The Past and the Present Law, Doctrine, Practice. Five Hundred Years
   Anniversary of the Nihil novi Statute of 1505–56th Conference of International Commision for
   the History of Representative and Parliamentary Institutions in Cracow and Radom (September
   5–8, 2005). Studies presented to the International Commision for the History of Representative
   and Parliamentary Institutions*, vol. 84, ed. Wacław Uruszczak, Kazimierz Baran, and Anna
   Karabowicz (Warsaw: Wydawnictwo Sejmowe, 2007). The beginning of parliamentarism
   in the Kingdom of Poland and the Grand Duchy of Lithuania is introduced from a com-
   parative perspective in T. Wünsch, "Mittelarterliche Anfänge der Parlamentageschichte:
   Heiliges Römisches Reich und Polnisch-Litauische Union im Vergleich," *Studia Warmińskie*
   27 (2000): 69–88.
3 For discussion of the genesis of the GDL's Sejm and the changes it underwent, see
   R. Petrauskas, "Lietuvos Didžiosios Kunigaikštystės seimo ištakos: didžiojo kunigaikščio
   taryba ir bajorų suvažiavimai XIV-XV a.," *Parlamento studijos* 3 (2005): 10–32; idem, "LDK
   bajoriško seimo susiformavimas Vidurio Rytų Europos luominių susirinkimų kontekste,"
   in *Parlamentarizmo genezė Europoje ir Lietuvos atvejis. Tarptautinės mokslinės konferencijos
   medžiaga* (Vilnius: Vilniaus universiteto leidykla, 2008), 5–15. The latter source includes
   a bibliography of works on the topic. For comparison, see Lidia Korczak, "Początki litews-
   kiego parlamentaryzmu na tle porównawczym," in *Parlamentskiia struktury ul*ady u sisteme
   dziazhaunaga kiravaniia Vialikaga kniastva Litouskaga i Rėchy Paspalitai u XV-XVIII stagod-
   dziakh (Minsk: Belaruski instytut pravaznawstva, 2008), 27–40.

their character in the second half of the fifteenth century, there is still no reason to discuss them as institutional in nature or to call them Sejms before 1492. The work of these proto-sejms was not regulated by any sort of decrees and the procedure by which they were convened (such as the number of representatives, places from which individuals were invited, and so forth) is altogether unknown. People who had various interests would gather at these congresses. Only at the turn of the sixteenth century, at the beginning of the rule of Alexander and Sigismund the Old, do we first encounter invitations for Sejms in which principles of representation were discussed.

The first such invitation attested in the sources was issued after Casimir's death in 1492. Prince Alexander and the Council of Lords sent letters to separate parts of the GDL, inviting them to elect a new ruler. The principle of representation was not yet spelled out in the invitations; instead, the addressees were told to invite "ten or twenty of your superiors, or as many as seem necessary to you." The most important thing, however, is the fact that this invitation was issued at all. It marked the beginning of a new, long-lasting tradition. From then on, all of the most important decisions for life in the GDL would be adopted and promulgated at Sejms. The year 1492 marks the established of an institutionalized order that had been jelling during almost the entire fifteenth century: the merging of political culture and institutional culture in the Sejm. At the turn of the sixteenth century, we see vigorously acceleration in the institutionalization of all spheres of life in Lithuania; the establishment of Sejms was part of it.

The first decades of the sixteenth century saw a perceptible change in the nature of the magnates' and boyars' congresses with the transformation of the Sejm into an institution structurally ordered to represent the estates. The beginning of the process coincides with the choosing of Sigismund the Old as Lithuanian Grand Duke in 1506. In 1507, Sigismund convened the first general Sejm in Vilnius. Dukes, magnates, and representatives of the boyars from all GDL lands were invited to attend. That the boyars were invited does not yet mean that they became full-fledged participants in decision-making all at once. As had been the case theretofore, decisions were adopted by the ruler together with the Council of Lords, with the boyar representatives only observing. The number of boyars who gathered at the first Sejm of Sigismund the Old, which coincided with the war against Muscovy, is not known. A new step in regulating the work of the Sejm was taken in 1512, when for the first time it was determined that each territorial or administrative unit would select two representatives. Before convening a general Sejm in Vilnius, Sigismund the Old ordered the

palatines and rulers of territories that bordered Muscovy and the Tatars to organize local congresses and choose two representatives who would be empowered to make decisions and send them on to the Sejm. He also ordered high administrators of other territories to come to Vilnius together with the boyars of administrative units under them, although here he did not indicate a specific number. At the time, the local territorial-administrative structure of the GDL had not yet fully formed, but a rule concerning representation of a specific settlement had appeared, became established, and would evolve into a general rule in the history of European parliamentarism. The GDL envoys to the 1514 Sejm, held in Vilnius, asked Sigismund the Old to allow only officials from the GDL to discharge all governing and administrative functions of their state during his lifetime, to remain in Lithuania until the end of the war with Muscovy, and to give the state a legal codex. In putting forth these demands, the political community understood the Sejm institution not only as a place to discuss urgent matters but also as a venue for political debate.

The first half of the sixteenth century was the key period in the genesis of the GDL's Sejm. It was then that the concept of "Sejm" came into consistent use in the state, that the principle of representation took shape and was implemented in a consistent manner, and that invitations for Sejms were addressed to specific individuals. The last-mentioned reform abolished the practice until then, in which almost anyone could attend a boyar congress. The structure and procedures of the Sejm became regulated. A Sejm chancellery headed by the GDL chancellor was established and, in an important novelty, began to keep written records of the Sejm's work. The first Sejm documents produced by the record-keepers were addresses written in the name of the Sejm, requests to the ruler, and his decisions in regard to them, which had the power of "answers," an acceped form of communication between the Sejm and a ruler who did not attend it.

In the first half of the sixteenth century, high-ranking state officials and members of the Council of Lords would address the ruler with requests in the name of the Sejm. These requests and the ruler's replies are the first written sources that allow us to talk not only about the genesis of the GDL's Sejm as an institution but also get a better feel for the foundations of the GDL's parliamentary culture.

As the war with Muscovy raged and burgeoned, Sejms were convened even without the participation of Sigismund the Old (as happened in 1519–1520, 1521, 1524, 1525, 1526, 1532, and 1538). In 1520, Lithuania's Council

of Lords repeatedly petitioned Sigismund the Old, who resided in Poland, to come to Lithuania. Replying through envoys and officials of the GDL, Sigismund refused because—so he explained—there was war in Prussia and several envoys from other countries were visiting the Kingdom of Poland. He advised the Council of Lords to discuss Lithuania's affairs in the Sejm as though he were taking part and to make decisions in the name of the Sejm that would best serve the wellbeing of the state. This missive, a copy of which is kept in the Lithuanian Metrica, reveals how dialogue between Sigismund the Old and the Sejm took place through his envoys. The envoys conveyed his words with a special prefix: "Our Ruler, the King and Grand Duke his Excellency Sigismund, orders your grace to speak." These "speeches," delivered by the envoys in the name of the king, were written down and ended up in the Lithuanian Metrica.[4]

Another possible example of Sigismund the Old's communication with the GDL Sejm is a response recorded in the Metrica by Sigismund the Old to the Council of Lords in 1526, sent through an envoy to the bishop of Kyiv. The envoy laid out to those involved that Sigismund Augustus had mandated the lords who had gathered at the Vilnius Sejm to discuss the following.

1. Issues concerning Muscovy. The first Moscow war with GDL began in 1493. In 1494, an "everlasting" peace treaty was signed. But the war continued and became permanent. In 1518, ceasefire agreements were concluded. In 1522 the GDL and the State of Moscow have concluded a new ceasefire agreement,[5] but a more permanent solution was sought.

2. Issues concerning the borders in Livonia, a subject of disputes between the GDL and Moscow.

3. The question of the Volga Tatars. The GDL territory reached the Black Sea at the end of the fourteenth century, where the GDL met with the

---

4 "Gospodar nash, korol´ i velikii kn(ia)z´ ego m(i)l(o)sti Zhikgimon″t velel v(a)shoi m(i)losti govoriti. [Toruń, after 07.05.1520.] Posel´stvo ot g(o)s(po)dara korolia ego milosti panov rad ikh m(i)l(o)sti Velikogo Kniaztva Litovsskog(o) panom Iurem Mikolaevichom Radivilovicha, starostoiu goroden´skim, a p(a)nom B(o)gushom B(o)govitinovichom, podskar(bim) zem(skim), m(arshalkom) i pis(arem), drzhav(tsoiu) kamenits″kim," *Lietuvos Metrika, Užrašymų knyga 7*, no. 201, 379–381.

5 The text of the 1522 ceasefire agreement is published in *Lietuvos Didžiosios Kunigaikštystės ir Maskvos valstybės sutartys. 1449–1556 metai*, ed. Marius Sirutavičius, no. 9, 137–142 (Vilnius: Versus aureus, 2016). See also Marius Sirutavičius, "Tarpvalstybinės sutartys Lietuvos ir Maskvs diplomatinių santykių praktikoje XV a. Pabaigoje—XVI a. Šeštajame dešimtmetyje," ibid., 19–43.

Golden Horde. After the Golden Horde collapsed, several new states were created in its place. In the fifteenth and the sixteenth century, the GDL had many different contacts with the Tatar states, not all of them peaceful.

4. The issue of the Crimean khan, another important matter of GDL foreign policy.

5. Matters related to the fortification and maintenance of castles on the border. Sigismund the Old advised the Council of Lords to make inquiries about the opinion of the Grand Duke of Muscovy on peace with the Grand Duchy of Lithuania through the envoys of the Pope and the Emperor, and quickly to prepare a mission to Moscow upon receiving his instruction.[6]

The 1538 Sejm, held in Navahrudak, may be offered as another example of how the work of the GDL's Sejm was organized in the first half of the sixteenth century and what questions were discussed there. Sigismund Augustus addressed the members of Lithuania's Council of Lords, the dukes, the magnates, and the boyars who had gathered at the staging point of the conscript army in Navahrudak, with a request to discuss relevant issues of state. Sigismund Augustus personally set forth the matters to be debated. Once the document containing these proposals was delivered to Navahrudak by an envoy, a dialogue between Sigismund the Old and the Sejm began. The assemblymen examined and discussed Sigismund's suggestions and laid out the political community's questions of concern for Sigismund in the name of the entirety of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania. The queries were delivered to Poland by envoys delegated by the Sejm, which received replies from Sigismund the Old through the same messengers.[7]

It was also in 1538 that Sigismund the Old took part in the Kingdom of Poland's Sejm in Piotrków as the King of Poland. At roughly the same time, he convened a sejm in Vilnius as the Grand Duke—again dialoguing with the Lithuanian assembly from a distance.[8]

---

6 Published as "[Malbork, 03.08–04.15.1526.] Otkaz naprotivku poselstva do panov rad Velikogo Kniaz´stva Litov´skogo kniazem Mikolaem Vezhkgailom, biskupom kievskim," ibid., no. 253, 460–462.

7 Liubavskii, *Litovsko-Russkii seim*, 271–282.

8 Published as "[02.14.1538.] Poselstvo ot g(o)s(po)d(a)ria korolia ego m(i)l(o)sti do prel-atov i do panov rad Velikogo Kn(ia)z´stva Litovskogo cherez podskarbego zem″skogo, mar″shalka i pisaria Ivana Gornostaia s soimy valnogo, s Pet″r″kova poslano na s″em″

Verbal communication and word-of-mouth provision of information were very important for the GDL's political culture because the still-nascent Sejm's written documents remained relatively inaccessible to the average boyar in the territorially vast Grand Duchy. Sejm participants returned home and discussed the information they had received during the assembly with those who had not taken part, who in this manner found out aboud the decisions that had been made. In addition, a specific parliamentary language began to take shape and come into use.

The examples provided show that the magnates dominated the parliamentary work of the GDL Sejm at first. All of the highest offices were concentrated in their hands. However, the most active boyars of the political nation also received their first lessons in parliamentarism due to their work in the Sejm. As the doings of the sejm as an institution expanded, boyars of these kinds grew in number. In the first half of the sixteenth century, the Sejm became the political nation's primary venue of domestic communication, a crucial forum for the state's political life, and the place where the parliamentary culture of the GDL formed in the early modern period. Even though most of the boyars would play only a secondary role in this activity—participating in district-level sejmiks and not in the national Sejm—for much time to come and receiving nothing but unwritten information—these very circumstances created conditions under which the political self-awareness of the ruling boyar class grew. Thus the boyars mastered matters of state and learned to understand, combine, declare, and defend their interests in the Sejms.

The GDL's Sejm completed its organizing process as an institution in 1564–1566, when its formal parliamentary status was enshrined in the Second Lithuanian Statute (1566) and its structure was assembled in all of its components by 1569. Although the founders of the Sejm patterned their work after the Polish model, they adjusted it to the conditions of the GDL and thus imbued it with a different brand of political culture. The Lithuanian Sejm was a creation of the country's political nation, a new form of political representation and an expression of class solidarity. It became a place for the development, expression, and dissemination of the political nation's traditions of parliamentary culture. It was in its atmosphere that the system of social, political, and state values formed and spread. In the middle of the sixteenth century, the GDL

---

valnyi vilen´skii, pod lety Bozhego narozhen´ia titsecha piat´sot trydtsat osmyi m(e)s(e)tsa fev(ralia) 14 d(e)n´, in″dykt 11 II [183*(148)*]," *Lietuvos Metrika, Užrašymų knyga 15 (1528–1538)*, ed. Artūras Dubonis (Vilnius: Žara, 2002), 204–206.

Sejm brought two periods together—the late medieval and the early modern— and left its mark on the culture of parliamentarism in Central Eastern Europe.[9]

The new parliamentary structure of the GDL operated autonomously for slightly less than three years. Even so, as Robert Frost observes, the new structure, comprised of sejmiks as well as Sejms that convened every two years, became firmly entrenched in Lithuania with surprising celerity. The boyars in the districts adopted the culture of parlimentary discusion and swiftly made their own. Frost notes correctly that historians guided by recent interest in the structures of dependency between magnates and boyars traditionally emphasize the power of the magnates in Lithuania, thus overshadowing and failing to underline the interest of middling and rich boyars in both parochial and national political life, in which the boyars distinguished themselves approximately a century after 1569. Recent research shows that large numbers of GDL boyars participated in sejmiks and that some took up important positions and contributed much to the formation of the Commonwealth's political life. Having taken a deeper look at the real mechanism of the relationship and dependency that existed between the magnates and boyars, one can say that Lithuanian magnates had to look closely at these citizens' interests and opinions because their own power was definitely not limitless.[10]

Here I augment and expand upon Frost's idea. It is important to remember the importance of the clientele system that formed in the sixteenth century in shaping relations within the GDL's political community. The appearance and spread of patron-client relationships coincided with very dynamic changes in all spheres of boyar life. The most important factor in domestic politics was preparation for the renewal of the union with Poland. The lengthy period of war with Muscovy, starting in the late fifteenth century, and the problem of Livonia and the search for a way to solve it affected the boyar society at large and each male boyar in the sphere of international relations. The magnates' pivot toward the Reformation attracted much of the boyar class as well, Catholics and Orthodox believers converting to Protestantism. The new faith strengthened

9 A. Zakrzewski, "Odrębność systemu parlamentarnego Wielkiego Księstwa Litewskiego w XVI–XVIII wieku," in *Rzeczpospolita w XVI–XVIII wieku. Państwo czy wspólnota?*, ed. Bogusław Dybaś, Pawel Hanczewski, and Tomasz Kempa (Toruń: Wydawnictwo Naukowe Uniwersytetu Mikołaja Kopernika, 2007), 107–128.

10 R. I. Frost, "Lietuvos indėlis formuojant parlamentinę kultūrą Lietuvos-Lenkijos Respublikoje 1550–1668 m.," in *Parlamentarizmo genezė Europoje ir Lietuvos atvejis*, ed. A. Lukošaitis, M. Urbonaitė, R. Budnikaitė (Vilnius: Parlamentinio bendradarbiavimo centras, 2008), 20.

magnate-boyar relations by promoting new ties. The quickly changing economic situation in Central Eastern Europe in the sixteenth century, and the agrarian reforms that began in the GDL, strengthened magnate-boyar relations in the economic sphere as well. Many new, educated, dedicated, and competent people were needed in the state service and in private business; this created opportunities for boyars to undertake various duties and pursue diverse careers. Not only did the support of a magnate or a patron not hinder relations between magnates and boyars; it even strengthened them. The new opportunities triggered sociopolitical activism among the boyars of the GDL boyars, prompted them to crave for participation in the public life of the state, and cultivated civic pride and patriotism. The nascent centers of political power and a more urban lifestyle played an important role in this process.

The districts, sejms, and sejmiks that covered the entirety of the state's territory became these sociopolitical centers in the second half of the sixteenth century. The by-then strong tradition of political clientelism helped the political nation to avoid internal fragmentation and confrontations between boyars and magnates. Strengthened by the absence of internal conflict and graced with recognized leaders in the form of the magnates, the political nation was better able to resist the ambitions and propaganda of the annexation-minded Polish boyar Executionists, who considered the Grand Duchy of Lithuania a province of the Crown and called it "New Poland." Political clientelism fostered the political nation's patriotism toward the state and its own self-awareness. It was these values that the boyars brought to the composite state of the Commonwealth and its parliamentary service.[11]

Frost finds it unfortunate that most historians who study the Lithuanian-Polish union assess the contribution of the GDL in forming the Commonwealth's parliamentary culture as rather weak. In his opinion, it is rather the contrary. The GDL, he says, played a very important role in forming the Commonwealth's unique parliamentary culture. Its impact on the Commonwealth's Sejm, he states with emphasis, surpassed that of Scotland or Ireland on the English Parliament after unions were made in 1707 and 1801. Although Poland was plainly dominant in the joint Lithuanian-Polish Sejm, one could not ignore Lithuania's voice. The members of Lithuania's senate were full-fledged and active participants in the parliament of the republic. Lithuania's participation in the Chamber of Envoys was also substantial. In the parliamentary procedure

---

11 See J. Kiaupienė, "Rola klienteli w procesie jednoczenia narodu politycznego Wielkiego Księstwa Litewskiego w XVI wieku," 167–178.

that took hold in the first half of the seventeenth century, every third leader of the Chamber of Envoys (titled the marshal) had to be a representative of the GDL during the Sejm. Frost emphasizes that Lithuania was at least an equal partner in the Commonwealth in regard to the law.[12]

The allegation of internal fragmentation in the GDL's political community was formulated and disseminated by Polish historians of the time in an act of transference: copying the model of boyar–magnate relations in the Sejms of the sixteenth century to the soil of Lithuanian parliamentarism. As we have seen, however, this soil was different. The perspective of Polish historiography is slowly changing today. In this sense, the introductory comparative work and conclusions of the Polish historian Ewa Dubas-Urwanowicz are well deserving of attention. Dubas-Urwanowicz compares the magnate classes in the Polish Crown and the GDL and their political and parliamentary behavior. She terms unfounded the fears expressed by Lithuanian magnates in discussions preceding the 1569 Union of Lublin, to the effect that the Polish procedures and parliamentary system would be imposed on Lithuania. As it happened, the Polish Crown did construct a scaffolding of representation-based state organization and rule around Lithuania. The GDL magnates, however, imbued this structure with content and drew the Polish elite into their wake.[13]

Just the same, the creation of a new common parliamentary culture with Poland was not very promising for the magnates of Lithuania at first. When the composite Polish–Lithuanian state was born in 1569, one joint Sejm was established. This Commonwealth Sejm, although conceived in the manner of an ordinary legislature, had much broader competence in real life. It chose the state's ruler, implemented domestic and foreign policy, managed diplomacy, shaped tax policy, and decided upon other matters of state. In the parliamentary structure that evolved from the separate Sejms of the Commonwealth's two constituent states, the GDL was represented by fewer than half of the seats. In the second half of the sixteenth century, GDL representatives were numbered from 71 to 85: 27 to 35 in the Senate and 44 to 50 in the Chamber of Envoys. The Kingdom of Poland, in contrast, was represented by 112–121 senators and 113–127 envoys. Some high-ranking officials of the GDL were left out of the Senate altogether.

---

12 Frost, "Lietuvos indėlis formuojant," 16–23.

13 E. Dubas-Urwanowicz, "Możnowładztwo Koronne i Wielkiego Księstwa Litewskiego w latach 1492–1569. Próba porównania," in Ciesielski and Filipczak-Kocur, *Rzeczpospolita państwem wielu narodowości i wyznań. XVI–XVIII wiek*, 179–195.

This underrepresentation in the joint Sejm drew the dissatisfaction of the GDL's political nation and became a real incentive to continue the traditions of independent parliamentary activity, making integration into the Commonwealth Sejm and the development of a common parliamentary culture more difficult. This came to the fore on July 6, 1572, when the death of Sigismund Augustus plunged the three-year-old Commonwealth into its first parliamentary crisis. The first interregnum (July 7, 1572–May 15, 1573) caught the Sejm unprepared. As the process of choosing a new ruler began, various interest groups formed in the Kingdom of Poland and the Grand Duchy of Lithuania. Local political congresses were convened and preparations for sejmiks made. In Lithuania, magnates who were well known in the political nation and had defended the independence of the Lithuanina state in the 1569 Lublin Sejm awarded themselves the right and duty to make political decisions. The GDL's Council of Lords, which had no legal standing but remained active in political life, became the central organ of government in the Commonwealth. Exploiting the lack of a statutory structural procedure for parliamentary and state work between the two constituent states of the Republic, the Council embarked on independent activity that it did not coordinate with Polish parliamentarians. The political community of the GDL gathered around the Council as the organizing center of Lithuanian political life. The mood and actions of the politically active society of the Republic in 1572–1573, reminiscent of those during the 1569 Lublin Sejm, show how different the political communities of Poland and Lithuania, and their aims, really were. The political activity of the Executionist boyars, which had waned in the first years of reunification, erupted again with new vigor in the Kingdom of Poland. The separate boyar congresses that began to be convened not only failed to maintain contact with the GDL's political community but also often ignored their own Polish senators. Concurrently, the initiative for adopting political decisions in the GDL belonged to the magnates, a group comprised of senators of the Republic, Lithuanian central and local government officials who were excluded from the Senate, and individuals who wielded political authority in society. The boyars in the GDL's districts continued their tradition of cooperating with the magnates, their political maturity and active involvement in formulating and making decisions steadily improving.

A new and important element augmented the GDL's political life during the first interregnum: meetings between Lithuanian senators and representatives of the nobility that were convened separately from their counterparts in the Kingdom of Poland. These congresses hosted not only discussions

about matters related to electing a new ruler but also decision-making debates about all issues in the Lithuanian state's domestic and foreign policy, treasury, defense, and law enforcement. At the initiative of the GDL's political elite, the first congress of this kind took place in August 1572. In the opinion of the researchers Henryk Lulewicz and Andrzej Rachuba, one cannot call this meeting either a sejmik or a congress of senators. In terms of the breadth of the issues discussed there, it reminds one of the Lithuanian state Sejm that preceded the Union of Lublin.[14]

In this manner, a new form of parliamentary activity that was neither sanctioned nor regulated by legal norms came into being and began to work alongside the parliamentary institutions foreseen by the Union of Lublin, that is, the joint Sejm of the Commonwealth and the separatedly convened district sejmiks of Poland and Lithuania. This new forum was later called the Lithuanian (or Vilnius) convocation. Lulewicz has collected and published sundry sources that attest to the existence of separate informal GDL parliamentary structures. Variously named (senior estate congresses, general sejmiks, senator congresses, senator and boyar congresses), none of them had been envisaged in the 1569 Union of Lublin. He also provides a comprehensive discussion of their parliamentary work and illuminates their role in the GDL's political life from 1569 until the middle of the seventeenth century.

The sources now known to researchers bear witness to at least twenty-seven congresses (thirteen of senators, fourteen for all classes) that took place in the GDL in 1572–1576 and 1586–1587.[15] GDL district sejmiks began to convene before the Lithuanian convocations did. The new forms of parliamentarism that developed during the first interregnum cultivated the public political and parliamentary working skills of the GDL's political community and strengthened relations between magnates and boyars through joint efforts. Striving to equalize the status of their state with that of Poland in the Commonwealth, the elite of Lithuania's political nation created new forms of parliamentary activity. By studying the quasi-parliamentary work that took place outside the framework of the joint Commonwealth Sejm, the questions discussed and decisions made in its venues, and the efforts to implement them, one gets acquainted with the GDL's political nation, its parliamentary work,

---

14 See Lulewicz, *Gniewów . . .*; see also A. Rachuba, *Wielkie Księstwo Litewskie*.

15 For source material, see Lulewicz, *Akta zjazdów stanów Wielkiego Księstwa Litewskiego*, vol. 1. For more on the results of research and assessments of these sources, see idem, *Elita polityczno-społeczna Wielkiego Księstwa Litewskiego w połowie XVII wieku*, PhD dissertation, Warsaw University, 1984; and idem, *Gniewów o unię ciąg dalszy*.

and relations with its union partner, the Kingdom of Poland, during the first interregnum.

The GDL political community, rallying around its leaders and senators, pledged special efforts to two aims that they considered the most important: repealing all articles of the Union of Lublin that violated the GDL's sovereignty and dignity and reclaiming the territories of the Lithuania state that had been ceded to Poland in 1569. Under the conditions brought on by the interregnum, it seemed possible for Lithuania to use its support of candidates for the Commonwealth throne to implement its own political plans without coordinating them with Poland. Contingency plans were drafted, as had been done since the ancient times of the personal union, to nominate a separate Lithuanian candidate for the Commonwealth throne and to support him in the elections, or even to organize separate elections for the Lithuanian Grand Duke.[16]

GDL politicians returned to this kind of policy upon the death of the ruler Stephen Báthory on December 12, 1586, which marked the beginning of a new interregnum and the need to choose a successor. The 1587–1588 elections showed that the Polish and Lithuanian political communities were still at odds and that their aims were different. Indeed, the Commonwealth Sejm's efforts to work collaboratively almost collapsed. The GDL's representatives participated in the electoral assembly but voted for neither of the candidates and did not recognize the results. In lieu of the Sejm, estate representatives called a congress in Vilnius on November 8–17, 1587, and essentially turned it into an informal election hall. Approximately 100 delegates participated in the gathering—senators, district boyars, and representatives of the Vilnius magistrate—and personally voted for the candidates to the throne, whom they called the Poles' chosen ones. In this way, representatives of the GDL political nation stressed that they had the right and duty to make a decision independently of Polish will. The delegates to the Vilnius congress emphasized the status of the GDL as an independent state in the Republic, one that had the right to make independent decisions and whose candidate was best suited to head the composite state. The convention revealed the GDL political nation, foremost the boyars, as having attained a somewhat higher level of maturity in the second interregnum than it had had in the first. As evidence, during the congress a group of boyars gathered in a faction that was separate from the Council of Lords but did not oppose it. This faction proceeded to approach Lithuania's

---

16 For more on this, see *Lietuvos istorija*, vol. 5, 228–269 (section "Lietuvos Didžioji Kunigaikštystė Abiejų Tautų Respublikoje").

senators with a political program that explained the values that should guide them in choosing between the two candidates to the Commonwealth throne.[17]

The boyars, calling themselves younger brothers of the Lithuanian senators, urged them to reach a consensus, stay united, and form a joint delegation with district representatives that would meet with both candidates, do its best to choose one without violating their unity, and extinguish the conflict that was harming the Republic, as was occurring among the Polish lords. In choosing a candidate, it was necessary to consider which of them would bring more benefit to Lithuania and ordain and then preserve peace with Muscovy and the state's other enemies. Once this candidate is determined, the boyars continued, he should be supported and voted for as the choice of the GDL, a country that makes up half of the Republic, irrespective of what the Poles are doing. Should the envoys from Lithuania find that a ruler has already been crowned and does not pose a threat to the state insofar as his interests might bring on a new war—a very important point for the GDL—they should present him with the privileges that assure Lithuania's rights and freedoms, the newly redacted Lithuanian Statute, and the provisions of the Lithuanian tribunal's work. Then they should demand that he vow to uphold them. If he refuses to do this, they should not recognize him as the ruler of the Republic, even though he has already been coronated, and should support another candidate who would confirm all of Lithuania's rights under oath.

The Lithuanian delegation that was empowered to negotiate with the candidates to the throne and the union partners to negotiate with Polish representatives in the Sejm in December 1587 adhered to this position. In the ensuing negotiations, they were able to convince Commonwealth ruler Sigismund III Vasa to issue privileges on January 28, 1588, that endorsed all of the GDL's rights and freedoms as well as issues agreed upon during the negotiations. Another contentious issue in the negotiations was how Sigismund's title should be presented. As the matter stood, this appellation began with "King of Poland," was followed by "Grand Duke of Lithuania," and only afterwards included words that bore witness to his rights to the throne of the Kingdom of Sweden. The elder son of King John III Vasa of Sweden and Catherine, daughter of Sigismund I Old, king of Poland and Grand duce of Lithuania, Sigismund belonged to Vasa dynasty through his father and to Jagiellon dynasty through his mother. He was elected king of Poland and Grand duke of Lithuania in

---

17 For source material on this, see Lulewicz, *Akta zjazdów stanów Wielkiego Księstwa Litewskiego*, vol. 1.

August 1587, succeeding king Stephen Báthory. In 1592, after his father`s death, he received the Commonwealth Sejm's permission to accept the Swedish throne. Sigismund Vasa was crowned king of Sweden in 1594. Shortly, the struggle for the Swedish throne began. In 1599 Sigismund Vasa lost the throne of the King of Sweden.

In examining a political culture, it is less important to study the nature of the parliamentary structures than to observe the forms in which the specific parliamentary work finds expression and the political values that its founders and nurturers shape and disseminate. The GDL's parliamentary activity shows the efforts of the political nation to compensate for the independent Sejm that was lost in 1569, to carve out a separate political space from the Kingdom of Poland in the newly created Commonwealth, and to create working institutions within this space.

The documents approved by the GDL congresses (letters to Polish senators and nobles, instructions to envoys to congresses of senators and estate representatives of the Kingdom of Poland and the Republic's electoral assemblies, correspondence with candidates for the Republic's throne, decisions made at congresses, and so forth) bear witness to the independent behavior of the GDL political nation vis-à-vis its Polish partner; shed light on the collaboration of magnates and district boyars for the Lithuanian state; and acquaint us with the names of not only the members of the Council of Lords and other representatives of the magnates, but also of politically active representatives of the boyars.

There were at least nine boyar representatives, most of whom were local officials who did not belong to the magnate class and who participated in the estate congress in Vilnius together with members of the Council of Lords in 1572–1573. This is just one example, but one that is characteristic of Lithuania's political life, of relations and cooperation between magnates and boyars and proof of the continuation of the pre-union tradition, when magnates initiated and organized action in common cause with boyars and their political clients. From the second interregnum (1574–1576) onward, it was not only those closest to the magnates who took part in these congresses together with senators but also a growing number of boyars sent by the districts.

The GDL's political nation was also saliently active in diplomacy, a field that came under the competency of the Sejm. The political nation not only took care of relations with Muscovy, the war with which continued. In choosing the first ruler of the Commonwealth who did not belong to the Jagiellonian dynasty, the political nation made perceptible efforts to introduce the Lithuanian state to Europe as an independent entity on an international

scale.[18] Henry de Valois, a member of the French ruling dynasty, was chosen as King of Poland and Grand Duke of Lithuania in 1573. Although he never visited the Grand Duchy during his brief reign, Lithuania's political elite found a way not only to develop personal contact with its new ruler but also to present the Duchy as an independent state at a meeting with Valois and at events involving members of the king's court, all of which occurred in France.

After choosing Henry of Valois, the Commonwealth Sejm empowered a delegation to go to Paris, apprise the winner of the election results, and bring him home. The diary of this mission, comprised of regular entries made during the journey, has survived. The entries, varied in their character, are considered to have had the purpose of being official information.[19]

There were only two GDL representatives in the eleven-person delegation: GDL Court Marshal Mikołaj Krzysztof Radziwiłł the Orphan, and Alexander Pronsky, son of the Palatine of Kyiv. They traveled with and were accompanied by a retinue of more than ten people.[20] Before the journey began, the young Radziwiłł met with Lithuanian senators and received from them a diplomatic task: upon reaching the king's court in France, he was to show emphatically that he represented a sovereign Lithuanian state not only in words but with his entire being. It was agreed that he would greet the French king and his brother, the Commonwealth king-designate, as a Commonwealth envoy—separately from the Polish envoys—and would declare Prince Henry of Valois the Grand Duke of Lithuania. Thus he would emphasize the GDL's independence and prestige. In the gathering of delegation members, M. K. Radziwiłł demanded that he, as a legitimate representative of the GDL in the Commonwealth mission, be allowed to speak in the name of the Lithuanian state at the ceremony with Henry of Valois in Paris. Radziwiłł the Orphan explained the following to his colleagues, the envoys of the Kingdom of Poland:

> The Lords of Lithuania have charged me with ensuring that the status of our state not be violated or humiliated. And since I, an official [marshal]

---

18 See Egidijus Banionis, *Lietuvos Didžiosios Kunigaikštystės pasiuntinių tarnyba XV-XVI amžiais*, ed. Zigmantas Kiaupa and Žydrūnas Mačiukas (Vilnius: Diemedžio leidykla, 1998); Kiaupienė, *"Mes, Lietuva,"* 196–219.

19 For more on the publication of the diary, see *Diariusz poselstwa Polskiego do Francji po Henryka Walezego w 1573 roku,* ed. Adam Przyboś and Roman Żelewski (Wrocław: Zakład Narodowy im. Ossolińskich, 1963).

20 The representatives of the political nation that accompanied the GDL envoys are named in the diary: *Diariusz poselstwa Polskiego do Francji po Henryka Walezego w 1573 roku*, 3.

of the court have been sent from among them [the Council of Lords] even though I know that among you senators I should be in the last and lowest position, I implore you, not to assign me to this last position, because we are only two envoys from such a large Duchy in this delegation. So that it should not seem to our Lord, our chosen Ruler, that our State is worse than your Poland and that I, being its envoy, listening to the greetings said in the name of the Kingdom of Poland, should not stand among you like an inanimate post, I wish to say in the name of the State, the Grand Duchy of Lithuania, what I have been entrusted to say.

Radziwiłł the Orphan then added with emphasis that if the Polish envoys disallowed him to speak in front of the delegation of the composite state as a member of the mission, he would do so separately as an envoy instructed and empowered to represent the Grand Duchy of Lithuania officially and publicly. The Polish representatives asked Radziwiłł the Orphan to not invoke these powers and to refrain from addressing Valois. Were he to do these things, to their thinking, it would indicate that there was no joint Polish and Lithuanian state but two separate states—a manner of conduct that would transgress the oath and the union.[21] The diary does not say whether Radziwiłł the Orphan carried out his intentions and greeted Henry of Valois in the name of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania at the official reception in the king's royal palace. It is known, however, that he spoke in the name of the Duchy at the parliament in Paris on September 13, 1573.[22]

The most important takeaway from this episode of Radziwiłł the Orphan's diplomatic work is his clearly expressed wish to be a citizen of an independent entity, that being the Grand Duchy of Lithuania.[23]

The year 1588 marked the beginning of a new period in Commonwealth life—the forty-four year reign of Sigismund III Vasa (1588–1632) and the sixteen-year term of his son and successor, Władysław IV Vasa (1632–1648). Thus life in the composite was undisturbed by interregnums for sixty years. Just the same, the congresses of Lithuanian senators and boyar envoys (the Vilnius convocations), which met separately from those in Poland, continued their work. This form of parliamentary endeavor by the GDL, with the

---

21 Ibid., 103–106.
22 Ibid., 195.
23 For a modern Polish historiographical view of Radziwiłł the Orphan as a politician, see T. Kempa, *Mikołaj Krzysztof Radziwiłł Sierotka (1549–1616), wojewoda wileński* (Warsaw: Wydawnictwo Naukowe Semper, 2000).

tacit consent of the Crown's representatives, became an adaptive part of the Commonwealth's parliamentary system. In the first half of the seventeenth century, however, the convocations became increasingly infrequent and some that were scheduled never took place.[24] The published proceeds of these gatherings shows that most common pattern of activity there was joint parliamentary work by senators and boyars; only in very rare cases did the boyars meet separately.

One of these exceptional cases was a convocation of boyars in Vilnius on May 12, 1607, coinciding with a session of the GDL's Supreme Tribunal. In Poland, a rebellion (*rokosz*) against Sigismund III Vasa's policies of strengthening his royal rule was under way. The GDL boyars had received an invitation from Poland to contribute to the insurgency and met to discuss the situation. Some had come to Vilnius to serve as judges in the Tribunal; others had done so to to bring their own affairs before the Tribunal. The convocation participants, seeing much in need of correction and alleging violations of their rights and freedoms in both the Polish Crown and the GDL, resolved to adhere to the union accords and adjudicate the problems that had arisen together with representatives from Poland.

There were no Polish envoys at the convocation. Wishing to get to the truth of the situation and to help their beleaguered homeland, however, the GDL representatives decided to send envoys to the rebel camp in Poland. GDL politicians first wanted to know the real goals of the rebels and then decide what to do.

Sixty-two participants ratified a convocation agreement, a letter that was presented to the rebels on behalf of the Vilnius Congress (an extract from the letter is given in the footnote 192) by affixing their signatures; forty-three others did so by placing their seals on the document.[25]

---

24 See Lulewicz, "Wstęp," in *Akta zjazdów stanów Wielkiego księstwa Litewskiego*, vol. 2.

25 "My urzędnicy, rycerstwo szlachta z różnych województw i powiatów WKsL, którzyśmy się tu do Wilna jedni dla odprawowania sądów głównych od braci obrani, drudzy dla spraw swych i potrzeb zjachali.... A nas braci swej przez uniwersały wzywają i proszą, żebyśmy się stawili do ichmm. na 28 d(nia) maja i spólnie z ichmm. ojczyznę utrapioną i wielą inkonwennencyi ściśnioną ratowali. Bacząc my tedy, że jako w Koronie, tak i w WKsL, jest rzeczy wiele w prawach i w wolnościach naszych zepsowanych, a życząc im naprawy, jakośmy nieraz u JKM tego przez posły nasze na sejmiech ekspostulowali, alesmy w żądościach [s] naszych żadnej pociechy nie odnosili. Poglądając i na to, że spisy unijej nas i z ichmm. pany koronnemi obowiązały, że spólne cosilia et auxilia we wszelakich przypadkach mieć mamy, nie chcąc i w tym razie gdzie idzie o postrzeżenie praw i wolności deesse ichmm., wyprawiliśmy do ichmm. posły bracią naszę, ichmm. pana Samuela Pietkiewicza, podstolego

This independent attitude on the part of the GDL's boyars demonstrates their political maturity and their ability to choose a method of parliamentary activity through which they could make decisions on issues experienced by their state.

Late medieval and early modern European parliaments that were based on the principle of representing ates created a mental space in which a unique political culture could develop and spread. An important vehicle for the expression of this culture was parliamentary rhetoric.[26] Contemporary European historiography devotes multifaceted attention to this topic by pledging special research projects to understanding it. Thus, recent historians are revisiting its historiography, emphasizing the importance of parliamentary rhetoric not only for getting to know the literature but also for making acquaintance with political, diplomatic, and legal cultures. They are also expanding the borders of the traditional interpretation of rhetoric—accentuating new theoretical aspects of the concept of parliamentary rhetoric, discussing specific cases of its manifestation, highlighting unique aspects of the culture of public speaking fostered by individual "political bodies," comparing them, and phrasing issues and strategies for further research.[27] This new research connects parliamentary rhetoric to university studies among the European ruling elite. It also investigates the ties between humanistic education and parliamentary rhetoric, which triggered changes in the topics of public political rhetoric and the way this endeavor was viewed as an art form. In addition, it emphasizes the role of rhetoric in the early modern period in forming political culture.[28] A specific type of

wileńskiego a pana Adama Wnuczka...," "Zjazd szlachecki na bazie Trybunału WKsL w Wilnie (5.12.1607)," 44. In "List zjazdu wysłany do rokoszan w Koronie, Wilno, 5.12.1607," ibid., no. 24, 176–178.

26 For a modern perspective on late-medieval and early modern parliamentary rhetoric, see "Parlamentsrede," in *Historische Wörterbuch der Rhetorik*, ed. Gert Ueding, vol. 6 (Tübingen: Max Niemeyer Verlag, 2003), 582–636.

27 See J. Helmrath and J. Feuchter, "Einleitung—Vormoderne Parlamentsoratorik," in *Politische Redekultur in der Vormoderne. Die Oratorik europäischer Parlamente in Spätmittelalter und Früher Neuzeit*, ed. Jörg Feuchter and Johannes Helmrath (Frankfurt a.M.: Campus Verlag, 2008), 9–22; J. Kopperschmidt, "Oratorik—ein erfolgversprechendes Forschungsprojekt?," ibid., 23–44; *New Chapters in the History of Rhetoric*, ed. Laurent Pernot (Leiden: Brill, 2009); J. Feuchter and J. Helmrath, "Oratory and Representation: the Rhetorical Culture of Political Assemblies, 1300–1600," *Parliaments, Estates and Representation* 29, no. 1 (2009): 53–66; P. Ihalainen and K. Palonen, "Parliamentary Sources in the Comparative Study of Conceptual History: Methodological Aspects and Illustrations of a Research Proposal," ibid., 17–34.

28 See J. Helmrath, "Rhetorik und 'Akademisierung' auf deutschen Reichstagen im 15. und 16. Jahrhundert," in *Im Spannungsfeld von Recht und Ritual. Soziale Kommunikation in Mittelalter*

political language began to form in parliaments in the middle of the fifteenth century, described in research by a new concept: the institutionalized social communication of the early modern period.[29]

The GDL's unique parliamentary rhetoric began to develop and spread in Eastern Central Europe in the late fifteenth century. New research has begun to focus on the parliamentary culture of Poland and Lithuania alongside that of other European countries, including that of the late medieval and early modern periods. An international project on European parliamentary rhetoric at that time was conducted in 2008–2012, titled "Oratorik auf europäischen Reichs- und Ständeversamlungen des späten Mittelalters und der beginnenden Neuzeit als Repräsentation politisch-socialer Ordnungen im Vergleich" and led by Professor Johannes Helmrath of Humboldt University. Within the framework of this project, based on historiography and other published sources, Kolja Lichy examined the rhetoric and ceremonies of the Sejms of the Kingdom of Poland and the Commonwealth in the sixteenth century and the first half of the seventeenth century, comparing the Polish-Lithuanian parliamentary culture with that of the Imperial Reichstag. Lichy focuses mainly on the theoretical aspect of the issue and the state of research in the field. While commenting on sources that represent the rhetoric of selected Polish parliamentarians,[30] he neither uses nor examines GDL parliamentarians' speeches as a source of rhetoric.

Indeed, this form of institutionalized social communication, important from the point of view of understanding the early modern political culture, has yet to become a specific topic of research in Lithuanian historiography. Perhaps one of the most important impediments to research on this subject in Lithuanian historiography is the lack of sources for this work. In terms of political culture, the sources from the time on the doings of independent GDL Sejms (up to the 1569 Union of Lublin) are not informative. Few

und Früher Neuzeit, ed. Heinz Duchhardt and Gert Melville (Köln: Böhlau Verlag, 1997), 423–446; idem, "Der europäische Humanismus und die Funktionen der Rhetorik," in *Funktionen des Humanismus. Studien zur Nutzen des Neuen in der humanistischen Kultur*, ed. T. Maissen and G. Walther (Göttingen: Wallstein Verlag, 2006), 18–48.

29 See D. Mertens, "Die Rede als institutionalisierte Kommunikation im Zeitalter des Humanismus," in *Im Spannungsfeld von Recht und Ritual*, 401–421.

30 K. Lichy, "How to do Politics with Words: Oratory, Ceremonial and Procedure in the Sejm and the Reichstag (c. 1500–1570)," *Parliaments, Estates and Representation*, 29, no. 1 (2009): 67–84; idem, "Reden als Aushandeln: Rhetorik und Zeremoniell auf dem polnisch-litauischen Sejm zu Beginn der Wasa-Zeit," in *Politische Redekultur in der Vormoderne*, 149–172.

written texts available to historians reveal communication between members of the Lithuanian Council of Lords and their ruler and demands expressed in writing by important politicians. Even these documents offer no explanation of how they were prepared or what discussions took place during the time documented. The early Lithuanian parliamentary rhetoric cannot be researched based on "requests" from boyars and high-ranking state officials and "replies" from the ruler in the first half of the sixteenth century onward as are recorded in the Lithuanian Metrica and discussed in this book. Neither can such study be undertaken by consulting sporadic political statements made in the Council of Lords and the various Sejms. Sources of another kind are needed for such research.

To assemble a corpus of compensatory sources, scholars may call on diaries (*diariusze, dzienniki sejmowe*) of the Kingdom of Poland from the second half of the sixteenth century to the first half of the seventeenth century, as well as those of the Commonwealth Sejms in Poland from 1569 onward. Below I assess the representativity of these sources and discuss the material that they provide in order to examine the rhetoric of the GDL's sejm. I will also discuss the problematic aspects of these sources.

Historians who deal with early modern Lithuanian parliamentarism must rely on Sejm diaries written in the Kingdom of Poland because no corresponding diaries from the GDL have been found. Researchers are familiar with the memoir of the early seventeenth-century GDL parliamentarian Albrycht Stanisław Radziwiłł. This source, however, is not a diary and does not contain speeches delivered during parliamentary sessions.[31] This leaves no choice but to harvest materials from the diaries of the Kingdom of Poland and, after 1569, the joint Commonwealth Sejm, the publication of which began in Poland in the nineteenth century.[32] Speeches by Lithuanian parliamentarians and records of discussions do give some acquaintance with the content and form

---

31 Albrycht Stanisław Radziwiłł, *Memoriale Rerum Gestarum in Polonia 1632–1656*, vol. 1: *1632–1633*; vol. 2: *1634–1639*; vol. 3: *1640–1647*; vol. 4: *1648–1656*; vol. 5: *Index* (Wrocław: Wydawnictwo Polskiej Akademii Nauk, 1968, 1970, 1972, 1974, 1975); Albrycht Stanisław Radziwiłł, *Pamiętnik o dziejach w Polsce*, vol. 1: *1632–1636*; vol. 2: *1637–1646*; vol. 3: *1647–1656*, ed. Adam Przyboś and Roman Żelewski (Warsaw: Panstwowy Instytut Wydawniczy, 1980).

32 For more on the chronology of the Sejms as well as published and unpublished diaries, see W. Konopczyński, *Chronologia sejmów polskich 1493–1793* (Kraków: Polska Akademia Umiejętności, 1948). One should be reminded in using this work that supplemental information about individual Sejms and their diaries have been published in various publications over the last several decades.

of the Lithuanian political culture and allow it to be compared with that of the Poles. In using these sources, however, one should always keep their origin and their authors' political and state orientation in mind.

Some diaries from the Polish and Commonwealth Sejms between the second half of the sixteenth century and the first half of the seventeenth century have been published and are well-known to researchers. Appearimg in the most recent bibliography of parliamentarism in the Commonwealth, published in 2012, they include Sejms from the following years: 1548, 1553, 1555, 1556–1557, 1558, 1562–1563, 1563–1564, 1565, 1566 1569, 1570, 1572 (only in part), 1581, 1582 (only part), 1585, 1587, 1591–1592, 1597, and 1633.[33] The list provided by the bibliographers includes the Sejm diaries of the Commonwealth, or the published sections thereof, which date to the first half of the seventeenth century.[34] This general information about published diaries only lets the reader get her or his bearings, as the list is regularly augmented. Additional unpublished and as-yet unresearched Sejm diaries from Poland during the time under discussion are kept in various manuscript repositories.

As the publication of diaries progresses, research on the parliamentary rhetoric of Poland in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries has begun. Noteworthy among these works is an analysis by the Polish literary historian Krystyna Płachcińska of 343 speeches preserved in the diaries of four sixteenth-century Polish Sejms (the 1556–1557 Warsaw Sejm; the 1558–1559 Piotrków Sejm; the 1562–1563 Piotrków Sejm; and the 1563–1564 Warsaw Sejm).[35] Płachcińska's aims, in the main, are to discuss the speeches of the Sejms as examples of oratory art and to flesh out the portrait of rhetorical culture of

---

33 For further description of the publications, see Kołodziej and Zwierzykowski, *Bibliografia parlamentaryzmu*, nos. 8, 13, 14, 20, 27, 32, 38, 41, 42, 44, 55, 56, 57, 58, 59, 60, 61, 62, 64, 69, 73, 78, 142. 152. 163. A bibliography of research on the subject is also included.

34 Jakub Michałowski, *Jakuba Michałowskiego, wojskiego Lubelskiego a póżnej kasztela Bieckiego, Księga pamiętnicza, z dawnego rękopisa będącego własnośią Ludwika Hr. Morsztyna* (Kraków: C. K. Towarzystwo naukowe Krakowskie, 1864), no. 54 ("Dyaryusz konwokacyi Warszawskiej podczas bezkrólewia od dnia 16 lipca do 1 sierpnia 1648 odprawiającej się," 101–144), no. 97 ("Dyaryusz sejmu elekcyjnego w r. 1648 dnia 6 October początego a dnia 25 listopada skończonego," 219–361), mo. 118, 119 ("Dyaryusz konsulty Króla JMci z Senatorami, Warsaw, 1–7 czerwca 1649," 399–408); Radziwiłł, *Pamiętnik o dziejach w Polsce*.

35 K. Płachcińska, *Obraz kultury retorycznej społeczeństwa szlacheckiego na podstawie mów sejmowych z lat 1556–1564* (Łódz: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Łódzkiego, 2004). Płachcińska also presents and discusses earlier research on the parliamentary rhetoric of Poland, ibid., 8–11.

boyar society in sixteenth-century Poland. Her analysis of the speeches uses the traditional literary research methodology.

Płachcińska bases her research on the content and form of the rhetoric of Sejm members from Poland, particularly those affiliated with the Executionist movement, which enjoyed an upsurge of activity at that time. She also highlights speeches by GDL envoys to the Sejm: Bishop Walerian Protasewicz of Vilnius; Mikołaj Radziwiłł the Black, Palatine of Vilnius and delegation leader; Mikołaj Radziwiłł the Red, Hetman of the GDL and Palatine of Trakai; and Duke Ściapan Zbaraski, Palatine of Vitebsk, who participated in the work of the 1563–1564 Warsaw Sejm and discussed the reunification of the Kingdom of Poland and the Grand Duchy of Lithuania. However, only the speeches of Radziwiłł the Black are examined in the study; they are compared with those of Polish politicians from the perspectives of content and form. Some aspects particular to the parliamentary rhetoric of this prominent mid-seventeenth century Lithuanian politician are highlighted. The other Lithuanians who spoke during the discussions of the Warsaw Sejm are mentioned but their rhetoric is not analyzed.[36] It is in the diary of the 1563–1564 Warsaw Sejm that we find the first speeches by GDL Sejm envoys that are suitable for rhetorical examination. They predate the establishment of the Commonwealth; their contents are discussed in the chapter on the unification.

Not all the Polish Sejm diaries at this time contain speeches. Often the diarists merely retold events in the Sejm and showed what was discussed without recording parliamentarians' speeches and replies during discussions, in the best case briefly annotating what was said. Most of the speeches found in the diaries relate to special Sejms where questions of particular importance for society were discussed. A classic example, perhaps, is a pair of redactions of the diary of the 1569 Lublin Sejm, in which several speeches reveal the content and form of the political discussions in Lithuania and Poland concerning unification.[37] The diverse types of parliamentary speeches in this voluminous diary allow the researcher to conduct a comprehensive analysis of the political speech habits of GDL representatives and determine whether the rhetorical content and political vocabulary changed as the most important question about the future of the two societies and states was debated. The diary of the Lublin Sejm broadens the field of comparison concerning the parliamentary

---

36 Ibid., 178–185, 327, and table 5, "Wypowiedzi delegatów litewskich" (36), where the replies of Lithuanian representatives are recorded.

37 See *Dnevnik Liublinskago seima 1569 goda.*

rhetoric of Lithuania and Poland by presenting speeches of envoys from a third party that was greatly impacted by the reunification project: Royal Prussia. No specific research, however, has been done on the parliamentary speeches that appear in the diary of the 1569 Lublin Sejm. Research on this scale deserves separate study.

Additional important questions that arise for researchers of Sejm rhetoric is how the early modern Sejm diaries were written, why the speeches in the Sejm were written down, whether the speeches were revised as they were recorded, and who carried out this work. The Sejm diaries were written at the initiative of private individuals, politicians, or groups of them. Few diarists identified themselves by name. In some cases, a single diary may have been the work of several people. Most often, the diaries were written by senators' or envoys' secretaries or by scribes. Generally speaking, they collected information about what happened in the Sejm from participants'stories, notes, and documents, and, sometimes, by observing and taking notes at the Sejm and editing the raw material into diary form. At the time under discussion, there was no specific form for a Sejm diary. The format was chosen each time by the person who wrote the diary or who ordered it to be written. Speeches were recorded from notes made during Sejm sessions, or from memory, using texts of speeches that had been prepared beforehand.

As a rule, Płachcińska stresses, speeches were rendered identically in different redactions of Sejm diaries that were written by different individuals. This shows that the speeches were carefully recorded during the meetings or rewritten into the diary after the Sejm from speeches previously written down. Importantly, however, not all speeches made their way to the diarists; few remarks at closed meetings of senators or envoys were committed to writing.[38] Those who work with this kind of source must remember that these early modern Sejm diaries are not stenograms in the contemporary sense of the word. In the opinion of Irena Kaniewska, who prepared the diary of the 1566 Lublin Sejm for publication, the Sejm diary material should be used with a careful and critical eye because the information it contains was influenced by the interests, education, political leanings, faith, and professional and personal ties of those who commissioned the diaries and those who wrote them.[39]

---

38 Płachcińska, *Obraz kultury retorycznej*, 19–22.

39 *Diariusz sejmu lubelskiego 1566 roku*, ed. Irena Kaniewska (Wrocław: National Ossoliński Institute, 1980), VII–VIII.

As noted above, the speeches of GDL representatives in the early modern period have caught the eye of researchers and demonstrated their relevancy. The sources provide an opportunity to expand the scope of research to show how the speeches of prominent politicians and senators spread among the boyar community and influenced the political thought of the average boyar, who did not participate in the Sejms, and how the rhetorical culture of the Sejms shaped the landscape of the political culture. The unpublished material that resides in collections of historical sources shows that Polish and Lithuanian boyars took a growing interest in the work and rhetoric of the Sejms in the sixteenth century. The speeches of senators and envoys in the Commonwealth Sejm were rewritten and established lives of their own, outside the diaries, in the form of copied manuscripts or as published documents. An example of speeches that burst forth from the hall of the Commonwealth Sejm during the reign of Sigismund III Vasa may be Janusz Radziwiłł's 1613 oration in the Senate,[40] which has become known and received much attention. It influenced the political attitude of the GDL noblemen. This speech can be an example of political communication between different classes of noblemen.

The speeches of the most famous orators in the Sejm, read out and discussed at gatherings of boyars, served as vehicles of institutionalized social communication and helped a new generation of politicians to mature. Unfortunately, few examples of the GDL's parliamentary rhetoric from the first half of the seventeenth century have been found. To acquaint oneself with the GDL boyars' parliamentary culture, one turns to the work of the boyars' district assemblies, the sejmiks. This lower chain of the GDL's parliamentary structure developed steadily throughout the sixteenth century.[41] The administrative and court reforms ratified by the 1565–1566 Vilnius Sejm stimulated essential changes in the flow of this lengthy and rather slow process. Sigismund Augustus provided a legal foundation for the beginning of the sejmiks' work by issuing a privilege on December 30, 1565. After this privilege, GDL sejmiks began to organize their labor base, creating a new territorial-administrative system.

---

40 Oświeconego Xiążęcia jego Mści Pana, Pana Janusza Radziwiłła, Xiążęcia, Na Bierżach, Dubinkach, Słucku, y Kopylu et. et Podczaszego W. X. Litewskiego, przy conclusiey Seymu Warszawskiego przed Królem Jego Mcią w Senacie mowa. Roku Pańskiego 1613. Speech tekst published in Jūratė Kiaupienė, "Lietuvos Didžiosios Kunigaikštystės ankstyvųjų Naujųjų laikų seimo retorikos pažinimo šaltiniai," in *Ministri historiae. Pagalbiniai istorijos mokslai Lietuvos Didžiosios Kunigaikštystės tyrimuose. Mokslinių straipsnių rinkinys, skirtas Edmundo Antano Rimšos 65-mečio sukakčiai*, ed. Zigmantas Kiaupa and Jolita Sarcevičienė (Vilnius: Lietuvos istorijos instituto leidykla, 2013), 290–293.

41 See I. Lappo, *Velikoe Kniazhestvo Litovskoe vo vtoroi polovine XVI stoletiia. Litovsko-russkii povet i ego seimiki* (Iur´ev, 1911).

In early 1566, a document titled "A Description of the District Borders of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania" was drafted. Although never finished, it indicates almost all the borders of the former thirty districts of the thirteen palatinates that existed at the time. (The GDL had nine palatinates in all; twenty-two districts remained after some of the Grand Duchy's territory was ceded to the Kingdom of Poland in 1569.)[42] Historians agree that the system of districts in the Kingdom of Poland was used as a model for Lithuanian territorial and administrative reforms. The way the reforms were implemented, however, shows that it was not just simply the reception of a ready-made system. The GDL's two-level territorial and administrative system was more polished than that of the Kingdom or the system has been improved. The first level was the palatinate, a broad territorial and administrative unit that was divided into districts. This structurally lower territorial and administrative level discharged various kinds of functions, unlike the Kingdom's districts, which were merely organizational units for the courts. They became the primary territorial and administrative structural unit of the GDL state in the second half of the sixteenth century. It was there that the entire chain of local government was concentrated. The palatinate's slew of bureaucratic officials was headed by the palatine. The highest official in the central district of a palatinate also became the leader of work in the district's sejmik. This is how, for example, palatines became the chief executives of the Vilnius and Trakai districts. In other districts, district marshals held this position. The districts also became organizational units for the boyar conscript army (in which capacity they were also called "flags"). The *chorąży* (standard-bearer) was one of the most important officials in the district; he was responsible for the organization of the district's boyar conscript army. Often standard-bearers were active in public life and brought the forces of the district's boyar community together politically. Castle courts operated in the districts, led by starostas appointed by the country's ruler, the Grand Duke. Land courts in the districts were staffed by officials chosen by the district's boyars.[43] The court and administrative system provided for by the district layout covered the entirety of the GDL like an interlocking chain, on a level that the Kingdom of Poland had not achieved.[44]

---

42 The document is published in "LDK pavietų ribų nustatymo projektas (1565–1566)," in Vilimas, *Lietuvos Didžiosios*, 199–218.

43 Vilimas, *Lietuvos Didžiosios*.

44 See H. Wisner, "Sejmiki litewskie w czasach Zygmunta III i Władysława IV. Konwokacja wileńska oraz sejmiki przedsejmowe i relacyjne," *Miscellanea historico-archivistica* 3: *Radziwiłłowie XVI–XVIII wieku: W kręgu polityki i kultury* (1989): 51–66; Lulewicz,

After the administrative reforms of 1565–1566, the districts became the most important spaces for public life in the GDL. Parliamentarism and forms of expressing political culture were learned in the district sejmiks; boyars' political thought and attitudes were cultivated there as well. The public political life of boyars in the districts was not heavily fenced off from the magnates and high-ranking state officials, as it was in the Kingdom of Poland. More often than not, boyar and magnate representatives discussed the most important issues of the state or district together and approved decisions, such as what position to adhere to in the Commonwealth Sejm, by consensus. Researchers of parliamentarism do not observe any substantial changes in the GDL in this constellation of relations until the end of the seventeenth century.

Polish historians, however, often write that participation in the work of the district sejmiks was a method that high-ranking state officials used to control and influence the boyars; they do not emphasize the harmonious relations that the boyars and the magnates maintained. They describe a modus operandi that took hold in the sixteenth century, in which palatinates, starostas, and other administrative officials chose district boyars at their own discretion and invited them to the Sejms, causing the boyars quickly to sour on these assemblies. As boyar self-awareness grew in the GDL, a bidirectional sense of common traits and aims between them and the boyars of Poland set in and gathered strength, binding the two groups together. In turn, specific methods of how the boyars fought began to form. The greatest impact on the beliefs and attitudes of the Lithuanian boyars was made by the Podlasian boyars who from the early sixteenth century spoke in the Sejms about the need to create parliamentary institutions based on the Polish example.[45] This is one perspective on the development of parliamentarism as expressed in Polish historiography. Do the sources allow us to view the issue of boyar parliamentarism in the GDL from the other side and see more than just a reflection of magnate–boyar relations in the Kingdom of Poland? To answer, we need to revisit the material from the district sejmiks.

The pre-Sejm district sejmiks provide more information on the GDL political culture than does any other source, and their instructions to envoys to Sejms are a crucial source of knowledge of the culture of parliamentary work in the GDL's Chamber of Deputies. Indeed, their first function was to recruit

---

Gniewów o unię ciąg dalszy; A. B. Zakrzewski, *Sejmiki Wielkiego Księstwa Litewskiego XVI–XVIII w. Ustrój i funkcionowanie: sejmik trocki* (Warsaw: Liber, 2007); idem, "Odrębność systemu parlamentarnego," 107–128.

45   Zakrzewski, "Odrębność systemu parlamentarnego," 107–108.

and instruct such envoys . It was for this that the concept of pre-Sejm sejmiks (Pol. *sejmik przedsejmowy*) and electoral sejmiks (Pol. *sejmik elekcyne*) arose. The beginning of their work was envisaged by Sigismund Augustus' aforementioned privilege of December 30, 1565. Once the date of the beginning of the Commonwealth was declared, pre-Sejm sejmiks were convened in the name of the ruler. If the ruler of the GDL was out of the country, sejmiks were convened by the palatines. Over time, the sejmiks' functions grew, diversified, and differed from one district to another. Although their practical work often deviated from the letter of the law, their competence and work were clearly regulated by statute from the very beginning.[46] The competence of the GDL's district sejmiks, and their work was clearly regulated by law from the very beginning. However, what was done in practice often departed from what the rules stated.[47] The procedure for the sejmiks' establishment and record-keeping were not regulated by law until 1768. Where a district's boyars should convene and what procedure they should follow in discussing and drafting instructions were not determined.[48] The boyars from the districts drew up instructions on the basis of local customs.

Unfortunately, few instructions from GDL district sejmiks between the second half of the sixteenth century and the first half of the seventeenth have survived. Even these vestiges are far from evenly distributed. Many are comprised of short entries divided into articles that advise us of the kinds of issues that the boyar-appointed envoys were to take up in the Commonwealth Sejm. There are very few instructions that allow us to see how a district sejmik operated, who spoke, what they spoke about, and how they spoke in the sejmiks, that is, to sense the spirit of the boyars' parliamentary culture. At the very outset of their parliamentary work, the boyars from the GDL's districts were not yet sufficiently prepared for the work of writing instructions and lacked the necessary skills for political literacy. Pre-sejmik instructions are also few. No sejmik diaries written in the GDL's districts during this early period have been found. The so-called debriefing or relational sejmiks, to which envoys who had taken part in general Sejms delivered reports that were then discussed, had barely begun operating before the middle of the seventeenth century. Only one

---

46 Zakrzewski, *Sejmiki Wielkiego Księstwa Litewskiego XVI–XVIII w.*; A. Radaman, "Kiravannie soimikavymi pasadzenniami u Viaikim Kniastve Litouskim, Ruskim i Zhamoitskim u drugoi palovine XVI–pachatku XVII st.," *Vestsi Belarusskaga derzhaunaga pedagogichnaga universiteta* 2 (2002): 120–132.

47 See Zakrzewski, *Sejmiki Wielkiego Księstwa Litewskiego XVI–XVIII w.*; Radaman, "Kiravannie."

48 Zakrzewski, "Odrębność systemu parlamentarnego," 124–125.

relational district sejmik is proved to have taken place in the Trakai Palatinate; it occurred in 1624.[49] Thus research must be based on instructions from district sejmiks that were written before Sejms, which at least in part uncover main issues of concern to the boyars and show what measures they took to find solutions for them.

The sources show that envoys from the GDL's palatinates and districts participated in the 1569 Lublin Sejm. They include a list of names that with which we can determine which district officials took part in creating the 1569 union with the Kingdom of Poland and establishing the Commonwealth.[50] We can only assume, however, that these district envoys were appointed in district sejmiks. We do not know the powers that were invested in them; there are no known instructions from sejmiks that preceded this Sejm.

The earliest manuscript from the GDL that provides an instruction is from the Vilnius district sejmik in 1570. According to its publisher, the Polish historian Henryk Lulewicz,[51] the shape and structure of the instruction are reminiscent of the parliamentary culture of the first half of the sixteenth century. Lulewicz emphasizes that the highest-ranking official of the state at the time, Senator Mikołaj Radziwiłł the Red, observed the work of the Vilnius sejmik in order to assess the mood of the district boyars in the Commonwealth's first years. This is proved by brief commentary from Radziwiłł the Red that was included in the instruction.

In one provision of this document, the GDL boyars who were appointed as envoys to the Republic's common Sejm were ordered to distance themselves from the Kingdom of Poland's interests and focus on issues pertaining to their own state.[52] By implication, the boyars of the Vilnius District felt that

---

49 See "Sejmiki trockie: dyrektorze, posłowie, deputaci w latach 1569–1790," in Zakrzewski, *Sejmiki Wielkiego Księstwa Litewskiego XVI–XVIII w.*

50 The text is published in "Panowie rady i posłowie ziemscy Wielkiego Księstwa Litewskiego odnawiają unję z Koroną polską, Lublin na sejmie, 1 lipca 1569 r.," in *Akta unji Polski z Litwą, 1385–1791*, no. 149, 354–356.

51 H. Lulewicz, "Najstarsza znana instrukcja sejmikowa z Wielkiego Księstwa Litewskiego. Sejmik wilenski przed sejmem warszawskim 1570 roku," in *Studia historyczno-prawne. Prace dedykowane Profesorowi Janowi Seredyce w siedemdziesiątą piątą rocznicę urodzin i czterdziestopięciolecie pracy naukowej*, ed. Janusz Dorobisz, Włodzimierz Kaczorowski (Opole: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Opolskiego, 2004), 171–180; the text of the instructions is published as: "Minuta instrukcji sejmiku wileńskiego przed sejmem 1570 r. b.m.d. [Wilno, marzec 1570 r.]," 178–180.

52 Lulewicz notes with emphasis that this dissociation from the Kingdom of Poland would become typical behavior on the part of Lithuanian representatives in the parliamentary life of the Commonwealth.

defending the GDL was the prime issue to be dealt with. They were concerned with whether or not the diplomatic mission that they had sent to Muscovy in 1570 would be able to conclude a peace accord or, at least, a truce. This, the Commonwealth's first large-scale diplomatic mission to the Grand Duchy of Muscovy, had already begun to take shape during the Lublin Sejm. It set out for Muscovy in the spring of 1570, led by two GDL representatives: Mikołaj Talwosz, the senior envoy and Palatine of Brest, and the mission secretary, Andrzej Iwanowicz Charytonowicz Obryński, the king's secretary, who came from the Navahrudak Palatine. In June 1570, these envoys executed a three-year truce agreement with the Grand Duchy of Muscovy.

The duties of a diplomatic envoy provided good career opportunities. For example, the aforementioned Talwosz was named castellan of Samogitia in 1570. Magnates and well-off boyars were posted to the Grand Duchy of Muscovy as senior envoys. The Belarusian historian Uladzimir Padalinski, who produced a portrait of the GDL diplomatic corps in the last three decades of the sixteenth century, notes the presence of Catholics, Protestants, and Orthodox believers among the appointees and adduces that religion played no role in their selection. What is notable is the high level of education of Lithuania's diplomatic envoys, many of whom had attended universities in Western Europe. Almost all of the GDL's senior envoys and secretaries were active participants in the public life of the state; many took part in Commonwealth Sejms. Lower diplomatic duties were performed by representatives of the district boyar class.[53] The GDL diplomatic service had gathered much experience in dealing with negotiations with Muscovy since the fifteenth century.[54]

---

53 See U. Padalinski, "Szlachta Wielkiego Księstwa Litewskiego w misjach dyplomatycznych Rzeczypospolitej (ostatnie trzydziestolecie XVI wieku)," in *Polska wobec wielkich konfliktów w Europie nowożytniej. Z dziejów dyplomacji i stosunków międzynarodowych w XV–XVIII wieku,* ed. Ryszarda Skowrona (Kraków: Societas Vistulana, 2009), 245–261. There is also a list of diplomatic envoys of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania who participated in the embassies of the Republic of the Two Nations in the Appendix: "Szlachta Wielkiego Księstwa Litewskiego w "wielkich" i "małych" poselstwach Rzeczypospolitej (1570–1600)," 262.

54 For more on the GDL's diplomatic service in the fifteenth through the seventeenth centuries, see Banionis, *Lietuvos Didžiosios Kunigaikštystės pasiuntinių tarnyba XV-XVI amžiais*; Marius Sirutavičius, "Lietuvos valdovo reprezentacija diplomatinių santykių su Maskvos valstybe praktikoje XV-XVI a. sandūroje," in *Lietuvos didysis kunigaikštis Aleksandras ir jo epocha. Straipsnių rinkinys,* ed. D. Steponavičienė (Vilnius: Vilniaus pilių valstybinio kultūrinio rezervato direkcija, 2007), 113–122; idem, "Maskvos pasiuntinių priėmimo ceremonialas Lietuvos valdovo dvare Vilniuje XV a. pabaigoje–XVI a. viduryje," in *Vilniaus Žemutinė pilis XIV-XIX a. pradžioje: 2005–2006 m. tyrimai,* ed. Liudas Glemža (Vilnius: Pilių tyrimo centras "Lietuvos pilys," 2007), 8–32; idem, "LDK Ponų taryba ir Maskvos

This long-lasting diplomatic service and representation of Lithuania's interests brought the magnates and boyars closer together politically and strengthened mutual trust, all of which gradually becoming part of the GDL's political culture.

In the 1570 instruction from Vilnius District, the envoys, all the nobles who sent messengers to the general parliament of the Commonwealth of the two unified states are urged to take care of national defense and engage the enemy on its territory instead of waiting for it to invade. Using the plural form, the emissaries are instructed to be as generous as possible with their lives and wealth and to be steadfast in the defense of their states, their ruler, and their homelands.[55]

The boyars of Vilnius District wanted assurances that the courts would work smoothly and the Lithuanian Statute would remain in force as before. They also wanted their ruler to alternate between living in Poland and in Lithuania, residing in each country for a year at a time, and to rule in accordance with the Lithuanian Statute while living in Vilnius. The instruction also reminds its readers sejmik envoys that not all of their privileges are recorded in the Statute and charges them to ask the king to record them. Therefore, the envoys are entrusted with asking for non-recorded privileges to be recorded in the Satute and then having the Statute printed.[56]

---

bajorai: formalieji paralelinės diplomatijos aspektai 1492–1569 m.," *Lietuvos istorijos metraštis* 2 (2010): 5–28; idem, "Lietuvos Didžiosios Kunigaikštystės ir Maskvos valstybės tarpvalstybinių sutarčių sudarymo ir ratifikavimo procedūros XV a. pabaigoje–XVI a. viduryje," in *Lietuvos Didžiosios Kunigaikštystės istorijos kraštovaizdis. Mokslinių straipsnių rinkinys*, ed. Ramunė Šmigelskytė-Stukienė (Vilnius: Lietuvos istorijos instituto leidykla, 2012), 195–220; idem, "Ceremonialinė mediacija Lietuvos Didžiosios Kunigaikštystės ir Maskvos valstybės diplomatiniuose santykiuose (XV a. pabaiga–1569 m.)," *Darbai ir dienos* 61 (2014): 167–182; idem, "'Ponai tarėjai' ir Maskvos valstybė: formalieji diplomatinių kontaktų aspektai pirmaisiais tarpuvaldžiais (1572–1576 m)," *Lietuvos istorijos metraštis* 2 (2013): 65–85. The text of diplomatic documents is available in Marius Sirutavičius, ed., *Lietuvos Didžiosios Kunigaikštystės ir Maskvos valstybės sutartys. 1449–1556 metai* (Vilnius: Versus aureus, 2016).

55 "...a my radzi przy panie naszym przeciw temu nieprzyjacielowi wyciągnemi, gardł i majętności naszych nielitując dla sławy pańskiej i dobrze[g]o ojczyzn swych, jedno aby go szukać w jego ziemi, a nie czekać do państw pana nasze[g]o.," "Minuta instrukcji sejmiku wileńskiego przed sejmem 1570 r. b.m.d. [Wilno, marzec 1570 r.]," 178.

56 "O sprawiedliwość ludzką, którym by obyczajem przędzej [s] iść mogła i odprawowała się. Ta aby wedla statutu odprawowana była, a Król Jego M[iłość] aby rok w Polszcze, a rok w Litwie, mieszkał i sądził litewskie [k. 61v] kauzy wedla Statutu ... bo nasze przywileja jeszcze nie wszystkie w Statut w[pisane, prosic o to Króla Jego M[iłoś]ci, aby byli wpisane, a Statut drukować," ibid., 179.

Although the 1570 Vilnius District instruction is terse and awkwardly worded, it leaves no doubt about the values of greatest importance to the boyars from the district: the capital of the GDL, their state and homeland (the Grand Duchy of Lithuania), its defense, and the Lithuanian Statute, the guardian of the boyars' rights and privileges. It was these that the envoys to the Warsaw Sejm were to preserve and defend.

The territorial integrity and invulnerability of the Lithuanian state are another oft-repeated theme in instructions from GDL district sejmiks between the second half of the sixteenth century and the first half of the seventeenth. Sejm envoys were told to insist vociferously that the palatines taken from the Lithuanian state and given over to the Kingdom of Poland in 1569 be returned to Lithuania. Instructions from the first decades of the seventeenth century show, however, that having won the war against Muscovy and reclaiming some of the Commonwealth's eastern lands, Sigismund III Vasa again violated the GDL's territorial integrity. The sejmiks protested preparations to annex to Poland the lands of Smolensk and Severskaya, which had been recovered in 1611, even though they had always belonged to the GDL until they were occupied by Muscovy.[57] A 1613 instruction from Minsk Palatine takes up this topic again, stating bluntly that part of the GDL's "body" had been separated from it and now had to be returned. It also reminds the reader that GDL Chancellor Leon Sapieha had submitted a protest concerning the return of these lands to the GDL. The sejmik even conditioned its envoys' right to acquire new powers with which to continue the war against Muscovy on resolving the question of returning Smolensk and Severskaya to the GDL.[58]

The district sejmiks' instructions show that as representatives of the political nation at the district level followed and responded to political events, they dealt not only with their own interests but also with those of the entire Lithuanian state as well as Commonwealth issues. This is why one may regard the sejmik instructions as documents that tracked problems that arose for the

---

57 "Smolensk ktory z łaski Bozei z wielą zamkow Siwierskiei ziemi za przewaznym staraniem J. K. M. do ręku J. K. M. przyszedł, tedy prosic i starac się oto aby według poprzysięzenia przodkow J. K. M. y samego J. K. M. do tegoz panstwa W.X.L. iako własnosc iego za osięzeniem za łaską Bozą y wszystkie ziemi Siwierskiey przywrocony był y aby kozdy co komu zdawna w tei prowincyi nalezało y na co słuszna prawo pokaze przy swoim ostawał," August 15, 1611, *AGAD, AR*, dz. II, 560, copy of the Oszmiana district sejmik instruction.

58 *AGAD, AR*, dz. II, 583, copy.

state and illuminate the methods that the district boyars proposed in order to solve them.

We often find both boyars and magnates among the district envoys to the Sejms. The district sejmiks' instructions frequently order the emissaries to the Commonwealth Sejm, once reaching the pre-Sejm meeting of GDL Sejm members, to meet and discuss the position they were going to adopt in the general Sejm. Thus, the officials and citizens (*obywatele*) who had gathered at the Oszmiana District sejmik on January 8, 1613 chose Duke Janusz Radziwiłł and Judge Jan Korsak of the district land court as their envoys to the Commonwealth Sejm. The sejmik then instructed these representatives, upon arrival at the GDL's meeting in Slonim, to meet and speak with all other representatives of all classes.[59] The same sejmik issued similar instructions to its chosen emissaries in 1615.[60] Those that had gathered for a district sejmik in Navahrudak in 1613 wrote in their instruction that the General Sejmik at Slonim was very much needed for all classes in the Grand Duchy, including boyars and senators.[61]

A thank-you letter to Krzysztof Radziwiłł from the boyars of Lida District, dated April 21, 1597, sheds light on relations between the boyars who represented the district in the Sejms and the magnate senators. In this document he boyars advise Senator Radziwiłł that, having found out about the work of the Warsaw Sejm (February 10–March 25, 1597) from a report by their envoys, they wish to thank him for his staunch defense of their rights and freedoms, sparing neither his health nor his time in the process. Thus, they continue, Radziwiłł shows that he is not only a true son of his homeland but also an honorable father of their Republic.[62] Readers of this instruction cannot but wonder what its authors had in mind when they used the word "Republic": was it the Grand Duchy of Lithuania or the Commonwealth of the Two Nations? Frequent explicit content in the instructions, that the reference is to "Our Homeland the Grand Duchy of Lithuania," suggests the answer.[63]

In this chapter, I shed light on the GDL's parliamentary culture through its relationship with the political culture and highlighted the most characteristic traits of the initial development of an independent parliamentary culture

---

59 *AGAD, AR*, dz. II, 585, signed and sealed original.
60 *AGAD, AR*, dz. II, 620, copy.
61 *AGAD, AR*, dz. II, 597, copy.
62 *AGAD, AR*, dz. II, 361, original.
63 *AGAD, AR*, dz. II, 597, copy.

(up to the 1569 Union of Lublin and the discontinuance of a separate GDL Sejm). I also described the situation in the first decades of the Commonwealth of the Two Nations (until the mid-seventeenth century), the manifestations of Lithuanian parliamentarism and the trends and changes that it underwent, and their ties with changes in the political culture. I hope that the material provided here, though fragmented, and the conclusions made will spur new discussions among historians who deal with Polish and Lithuanian parliamentarism.

"WE, THE NATION OF LITHUANIA." UNCOVERING THE VALUES OF THE GRAND DUCHY OF LITHUANIA'S POLITICAL CULTURE

PART III

Our contemporary Lithuanian society is separated from the GDL's early modern political nation by several centuries. Can a modern individual understand the kinds of political values that people of those distant times in the land of Lithuania cherished and fostered? How did these bygones understand the concepts of "state," "homeland," "love of homeland," and "patriotism?" Researchers cannot find one answer to these questions of early modern culture and identity that would please everyone.

An idea posed by the philosopher Hans-Georg Gadamer is close to the heart of modern man:

> Homeland is first and foremost the homeland of our language. One's native tongue preserves some sort of unseen homeness [*Heimatlichkeit*].… When we return home from a land of a foreign language, the unexpected meeting with our native tongue simply frightens us; … customs and the normal world are certainly filled with the sound of our own language.[1]

A historian who studies the political culture of the GDL during the early modern period, however, cannot but question the connection between Gadamer's reasoning about the concepts of "homeland" and "state" and one's native tongue, how far back one can transfer the equating of one's homeland with one's native language, and whether patriotism can be understood only through the prism of language. If we fail to understand the linguistic ties that bound together the GDL's multicultural, multilingual political community, we will not be able to understand the unique character of its political culture.

Although not omniscient, historians can pry open troves of historical sources where the riches of spiritual-culture values are kept. A study of political culture is not a study grounded solely in the retelling of lists of facts and records; it also requires interpretation. Each interpretation, however, has its limits. Thus I hesitate to maintain that I know what the people of the GDL's political nation from the second half of the fifteenth century to the first half of the seventeenth century thought and felt. They were scattered across numerous lands in a massive state, separated from one another by thousands of kilometers, often not speaking the same language, and believing in different faiths. I can only present the information recorded in sources for my readers' consideration. This information, as I show below, demonstrate that this community fostered values that

---

1   The quotation is from Hans-Georg Gadamer, "Heimat und Sprache," in Hans-Georg Gadamer, *Gesammelte Werke*, vol. 8 (Tübingen: C. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1993).

united its members as people and brought them together as a political nation.[2] Otherwise, it is doubtful that we would encounter in its writings the symbolically freighted expression "We, the Nation of LITHUANIA." What is behind this phrase? I attempted to find an answer while writing this book.

Using the term "abstract political community," common in modern sociology, helps us to understand how the multifaceted political nation of the GDL viewed itself and what it imagined its primary values to be.[3] This is not some sort of verbal hocus-pocus. The expression emphasizes the specialness of the community in question. Its abstract character sets it apart from the boyar class and other formal structures of the early modern period. Being a boyar, a member of the clergy, or a burgher provided one with an opportunity to be an active participant in public life. It were the individuals, however, who decided whether to take on duties tied to political activity that were for the good of the state and homeland by joining the political community. This is why, as repeatedly noted above, the GDL's political nation waxed and waned at different periods of time. As parts of this nation began to deal in affairs of state and defense of the state by various means, a system of political values that united this community gradually formed. Eventually, these values were understood and accepted by all members of the political nation irrespective of their ethnic origins, language, or religious beliefs. In the language of politics, the meanings of the words "state" and "homeland" began to become synonymous. The sources yield what one may consider a "catalogue" of symbols that express the values and patriotism of the GDL's political nation. It is not extensive but telling; it allows us to feel the mood of the political community at the time and understand what made the members of this community patriots of their homeland, Lithuania.[4]

"Homeland" was common coinage in the rhetoric of the GDL's political nation in the sixteenth century. Let us listen to its various meanings, which resound in texts that have survived to our times.[5]

---

2 About collective identity or theoretical definitions of "we" see: Jan Assmann, *Das kulturelle Gedächtnis. Schrift, Erinnerung und politische Identität in frühen Hochkulturen* (München: C. H. Beck, 2007) 130–133.

3 See J. Kilias, *Wspólnota abstrakcyjna. Zarys socjologii narodu* (Warsaw: Wydawnictwo Instytutu Filozofii i Socjologii PAN, 2004).

4 The question of patriotism during the period of the Kingdom of Poland and the Commonwealth of the Two Nations is examined in Jacek Kloczkowski, ed., *Patriotyzm polaków. Studia z historii idei* (Kraków: Ośrodek Mysli Politycznej, 2006).

5 For more details see Jūratė Kiaupienė, "Naród polityczny Wielkiego Księstwa Litewskiego w XVI wieku: pojęcie ojczyzny," 295–318.

In a document addressed to Queen Bona Sforca (the second wife of Sigismund I the Old, the King of Poland and Grand Duke of Lithuania) in 1525, GDL Chancellor and Vilnius Palatine Albert Gasztold explicitly called his homeland Lithuania, the state of Lithuania.[6] He reminded Bona Sforca that upon hearing of the rebellion that Duke Michael Gliński had whipped up against Sigismund Augustus, he told Gliński's envoys that "We, the nobles, cannot allow our homeland to be deserted, for which we are obligated to die, or break the oath of faithfulness to it…." Explaining how he defended his homeland against the enemy, he stressed the importance of both homelands, Vilnius and Trakai.[7]

Fifty years later, in a letter from 1576 to Stephen Báthory, the newly elected King of Poland and Grand Duke of Lithuania, another member of the GDL elite, Augustinas Rotundas, would write about the importance of sacrificing oneself for one's homeland. He explained that upon the loss of their king and ruler, the state's magnates and senators became for their homeland what fathers were for their children at home. This is why they are called fathers and senators. Their love of homeland, the correspondent continued with emphasis, forces them to think long and hard when choosing a new ruler. After all, it would be under his auspices that they would entrust such a precious thing, the most precious thing they possessed: the exercise of governing power in their homeland.[8]

The GDL's political elite expressed very clearly its relationship with its state and its perspective on the Kingdom of Poland. The political nation's patriotic frame of mind is best seen in critical periods of time when political tension between the two states spiked. In the middle of the sixteenth century, both states' political nations weighed the prospects of renewing and strengthening

---

6　"Albertas Goštautas, Vilniaus vaivada Bonai Sforcai, Lenkijos karalienei prieš kunigaikštį Konstantiną Ostrogiškį ir prieš Radvilas," transl. Eugenija Ulčinaitė, ed. Rimantas Jasas, in *Šešioliktojo amžiaus raštija*, vol. 5 of *Senoji Lietuvos literatūra*, ed. Sigitas Narbutas (Vilnius: Pradai, 2000), 31–54. The Latin version of the document was published in *Acta Tomiciana*, vol. 7, ed. Tytus Działyński (Poznań: Biblioteka Kórnicka, 1859), 258–269.

7　Ibid., 263: "…quia non licet nobis patriciis patriam, pro qua moriendum est, deserere, dno. Hereditario fidem violare, sed contra proditores ejus arma sumere et fortiter resistere, quare certum habeas, si veneris huc, tecum pugnabimus et certamen commitemus, imo te bello prosequimur.… Sic ego adolescens solus defendi patriam ab hoste et utraque precipua hujus patriae loca Vilnam et Troki in absentia non tantum domini regis Sermi, sed etiam omnium tunc sue Mtis. Vices gerentium tutatus magnanimiter conservati."

8　The Latin original is published in *Archiwum Komisji Prawniczej*, vol. 7, ed. Tytus Działyński (Kraków: Polska Akademia Umiejętności, 1900), XV–XXII.

the union. These discussions did more than yield interpretations of the union that would take shape; they also revealed the emotional ties within Lithuania's political community, which were strengthened with the renewal of the union.

There is an entry in the Lithuanian Metrica titled "Speech about the Polish Position Against the Grand Duchy of Lithuania in the 1564 Warsaw Sejm."[9] Its author is unknown. However, from the content of the text, written in the Chancery Slavonic, the written form of Old Church Slavonic, influenced by various Ruthenian dialects, that was used in the Lithuanian state.[10] One can surmise that it was written by a member of a GDL group that opposed the union. He consistently uses the concepts "Lithuania" and "the Grand Duchy of Lithuania." He writes:

> … In odd and sundry ways the Polish Lords want to induce Lithuania to be drawn into slavery and make them their prisoners for eternity. First they strove for one scepter, one stamp, one treasury. Afterwards, when they were not able to achieve this, they demanded that officials of Lithuania sign their names in the following way: Marshal of the Kingdom of Poland in the Grand Duchy of Lithuania. This is how all other officials were to sign as well. And [they demanded] that the ruler call himself the King of the Land of Poland and the Duchy of Lithuania."

Lithuania, however, found this unacceptable. Indeed, the author of the text uses the word "Lithuania" as a synonym for the Grand Duchy of Lithuania—not part of the state but the state in its entirety.

The crisis that struck the GDL boyar class when vast Lithuanian territories were torn from the state in 1569 gave researchers a slew of new sources. It also elicited stronger feelings in Sigismund Augustus and the political nation of the Polish Sejm than they would have expressed otherwise. Indeed, correspondence of the time reveals what GDL meant for the representatives of the political nation. For example, in a letter dated February 3, 1569, the Lithuanian state official Eustachy Wołowicz advised Duke Roman Sanguszko that his country had indeed agreed to live with Poland under one ruler but

---

9 *RGADA*, f. 389: *Lithuanian Metrica*, book 45: *Księgi spraw różnych, danin, zeznania, listów sejmowych (1561–1567)*, l. 61–61v.

10 Raimonda Ragauskienė, "Kalbinė padėtis Lietuvos Didžiojoje Kunigaikštystėje (iki XVI a. vid.): interpretacijos istoriografijoje," *Lituanistika* 59, no. 3 (2013): 138–157 (Summary "Linguistic situation in the Grand Duchy of Lithuania (until the mid-sixteenth century): Interpretation in historiography").

had clearly told the lords of the Crown that it could not downsize its state or renounce anything within it.[11]

On March 6, 1569, Maciej Sawicki, Sigismund Augustus's secretary and a pro-Lithuanian politician closely associated with the Radziwiłłs, addressed the Lithuanian court,[12] while reporting news from the Lublin Sejm, asking what he should do after the GDL delegation had unilaterally suspended the unification negotiations and left the Sejm. He called himself the "good-hearted servant of the Lords of Lithuania and the dear *Homeland and State*" (italics and capitalization mine—J.K.)[13] Describing the events in March 1569 in the Ukrainian lands that Poland had annexed, Sawicki reported how GDL landowners who had holdings there acted when Sigismund Augustus demanded that they swear allegiance to the Polish Crown. From his reports, we can once again be sure that the concept of "homeland" had a very clear meaning for the representatives of the GDL's political community. In talking about the stance and attitudes of Duke Konstanty Ostrogski, the Palatine of Kyiv, during this difficult period, Sawicki wrote that many Luthuanians had, in the name of the king, encouraged him to swear allegiance to the Polish Crown but that he would not comply because the Grand Duchy of Lithuania was his dear *Homeland*.[14]

Mikołaj Radziwiłł the Black, leader of the political nation at the time and head of the GDL's delegation to the 1569 Lublin Sejm, wrote on March 13, 1569, to Duke Roman Sanguszko about the Lithuanian state and his ties to it in the following way: "...We, the whole of the Duchy of Lithuania, … did not merge the throne of the Lithuanian Grand Duke as well as our duties with the Polish Crown and did not allow our Lord [our ruler] to give us to the Crown…." Continuing his train of thought, he invited Sanguszko to come to Vilnius and talk the matter over. In that forum, if Radziwłł the Red (1512–1584)

---

11 "Ostafi Wołowicz donosi X. Romanowi Sanguszkowi o czynnościach sejmu Lubelskiego, mającego przyprowadzić do skutku unię Korony z Litwą, w Lublinie 3 lutego 1569 r.," *Archiwum XX. Sanguszków w Sławucie*, vol. 2 of *Dyplomataryusz gałęzi Niesuchojeżskiej*, part 7: *1554–1572*, edited by Zygmunt Luba Radzimiński and Bronisław Gorczak (Lviv: J. Tarnowski, 1910), CCLIX, 319.

12 About M. Sawicki see more: Raimonda Ragauskienė, "Maciej Sawicki (około 1530–1581) klient Radziwiłłów z Podlasia," in *Szlachta i ziemiaństwo na pograniczu kultur dawnej Rzeczypospolitej od XVI do początku XX wieku*, ed. Dorota Michaluk and Krzysztof Mikulski (Warsaw: DiG, 2016), 23–40.

13 *Nowiny lubelskie*, Lublin, March 6, 1569; Naruszewicz, *Teki Naruszewicza*, vol. 77, document 21.

14 "…bardzo upominali go od krola wieley ludzie, ale już się odkrył, że pamięta czyj Syn i jakiego zawolania, i mowiąć, żał się Boże iż mię do karczeminkow Falszera i Buyna przyrównano, ja w tej klubie niechcę, i da Bog nie będę, do gardla, atoli mam iescze Raubnicze pod Cesarzem i tam mogę chleb ieśc iesli mię wypędzą z miley Oyczyzny," ibid.

were unable to do anything, he could at least dispatch GDL representatives to the king. They could then remind Sigismund Augustus about the oaths he had taken to the Lithuanian state and ask him not to behave toward "*our nation and state, the Grand Duchy of Lithuania*," in such a way as to detach Volhynia and Podolia from the Duchy, violate his oath, and serving the Lithuanians up to the Poles "like peasants."[15]

In a letter to Mikołaj Radziwiłł from Lublin in June 1569, Jan Chodkiewicz expressed overwhelmilng pain and despair: "Dear Uncle, the Lord of Trakai, who while dining with Lord Osoliński at my place, spoke about the ruin that unification would bring upon his 'dear homeland' [*amore patria*] and wished that he would never see it."[16]

The execution of the 1569 Union of Lublin and the creation of the composite Commonwealth of the Two Nations did not change overnight the patriotic values that had been evolving for several centuries. The image of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania as a state separate from Poland remained essentially constant in the political nation's collective mind right up until the turn of the seventeenth century.

In 1572, an unknown boyar wrote a political essay titled "On the Election of a New King," concerning the succession of the just-deceased Sigismund Augustus. In the first lines of this work, the author identifies his homeland as the Grand Duchy of Lithuania. Explaining why he chooses to discuss the candidacy of those vying for the Commonwealth throne, he again definitively affirms his tie to his homeland and his concern for its future. He reminds his readers that:

> …In the old chronicles we read that when the Grand Duke ruled only Lithuania, he was a powerful ruler and expanded its walls from the Prussian Sea [the Baltic Sea] even to the Ponto Sea [the Black Sea]. He also expanded the borders in the north and his rule spread far and wide. However, when we, the Polish Crown and Duchy of Lithuania, came under the dominion of one ruler, the Duchy began to blossom like an autumnal flower. The more time passed, the more it wilted, until only a faint mark of the old Lithuanian drive and beauty remained. We have already lost Pskov, Novgorod, and all of the Severskaya zemlya, while our

---

15 "List w[ojewo]dy Wileńskiego i kanclerza Lit[ewskiego], Mikołaja Radziwiłła do X[iążęcia] Romana Sanguszka w sprawie unii" (Zblany, March 13, 1569), *Archiwum XX. Sanguszków w Sławucie*, vol. 7, 320–321.

16 Jan Chodkiewicz to Mikołaj Radziwiłł (Lublin, June 6, 1569), *AGAD, AR*, dz. V, Syg. 2044, 20.

> enemy is shaking its shield almost near our Vilnius. Our state of Lithuania
> has fallen so because there the king is often not in the Duchy.[17]

When the second interregnum in the Commonwealth began in 1574, Mikołaj Krzysztof Radziwiłł the Orphan warned the Polish Chancellor, Great Hetman, and politician Jan Zamoyski in a letter that "If you want to ruin us, Lithuania, you will see how you will fall into ruin along with us."[18] After Henry of Valois departed from the Commonwealth in 1574, Jan Chodkiewicz opined in a missive to Radziwiłł the Red that the Polish lords had not done well to write a letter to the king (Henry of Valois) that included disrespectful words. Characterizing this sort of fury as a menace to his dear Duchy of Lithuania, his homeland, Chodkiewicz urged Radziwiłł to defend the honor of his dear homeland because "…We, Lithuania, are not responsible for this [Polish] rage."[19]

Jan Kiszka, Starosta of Samogitia, proposed to Krzysztof Radziwiłł in late 1586 that the Lithuanians gather to discuss elections for a ruler in a place where others would not hinder their debates. Further on in his letter, it becomes clear that this suggestion did not imply that the Lithuanians were preparing for a confrontation with Polish representatives. This choice was simply determined by the understanding that his state and its affairs were distinct from those of Poland. Kiszka had no doubt in his mind that he had to discuss issues of common concern together with the Polish senators—but in so doing must not forget the matters that pertained to his own state, because "Who can forbid us from doing that?"[20]

In 1587, it was concern for the "defense of his dear homeland" during the second interregnum that prompted Mikołaj Moniwyd Dorohostaiski, Palatine of Polotsk, to encourage Krzysztof Radziwiłł, GDL political leader and Palatine of Vilnius, to make the capital of Vilnius, his regular place of residence because "it is difficult without a superior."[21]

---

17 "Zdanie o obieraniu nowego króla," in *Pisma polityczne z czasów pierwszego bezkrolewia,* ed. Jan Czubek (Kraków: Nakl. Akademii Umiejętności, 1906), no. 23, 349–350.

18 Mikołaj Krzysztof Radziwiłł the Orphan to Jan Zamoyski (Niehniewicze, September 6, 1574), *Archiwum Jana Zamoyskiego, kanclerza i hetmana wielkiego Koronnego*, vol. 1, 1553–1579, ed. Wacław Sobieski (Warsaw: nakł. Maurycego Zamoyskiego, 1904), 69–72.

19 Jan Chodkiewicz to Mikołaj Radziwiłł the Red, September 30, 1574, Kaunas, *AGAD, AR,* dz. V, no. 2044, 73–76.

20 Jan Kiszka to Krzysztof Radziwiłł, December 24, 1586, Lubcza, *AGAD, AR*, dz. V, sygn. 6759, 29–31.

21 Mikołaj Moniwyd Dorohostaiski to Krzysztof Radziwiłł, April 21, 1587, Oszmiana, *AGAD, AR*, dz. sygn. 3214, 13–14.

Several years later, a quarter of a century having passed since the 1569 Union of Lublin, we see that the perception of the GDL, and of society's bond to it as their country and homeland, had not changed. What is interesting is that this was the viewpoint of a new generation of politicians that had come to maturity during the time of the Commonwealth.

Stanisław Radziwiłł, Starosta of Samogitia, wrote the following in a letter to his brother Krzysztof in 1595: "I glorify Our Lord Savior Almighty for having shown His favor by gracing our Grand Duchy of Lithuania with Your Highness, such a Senator and Hetman…."[22] That year, Leon Sapieha penned the following words about his homeland, the Grand Duchy of Lithuania, in a letter to Krzysztof Radziwiłł: "I myself will remain totally faithful to my homeland. Not only will I not affix a seal to anything that transgresses our law, but I will be prepared to oppose it together with Your Excellency."[23] He said this against the background of a discussion among the leaders of the GDL's political nation of a demand by Polish politicians to appoint a Pole as Bishop of Vilnius and reserve other duties and positions in the Lithuanian state for Polish citizens.

Jan Radwan's aforementioned heroic poem "Radviliada" is yet another important source that opens our eyes to the understanding of Homeland, the lyrical hero of the poem, as the state irrespective of any particular ethnic group. In "Radviliada," Radwan describes Lithuania more as a political and social construct than as an ethnic one. From the study on "Radviliada" by Sigitas Narbutas—an expert on the subject who translated the work into Lithuanian—one can understand this from the section of the poem in which Radwan glorifies the GDL's army, led by Stephen Báthory, as it gathered for its decisive battle against Muscovy.

> Armantur prompti pedites, equitumque procellae:
> Qui Vilnam, qui culta tenent tua rura Cunasse,
> Et quilittora habent, qua Nerys conditur ingens
> In vada Chrononis valles diffusa per imas,
> Et qui Trocorum campos, fortesque Vitebas
> Late habitant, qui sunt Orsae florentis in arvis,
> Qui nemorum saltus densos, agrosque frequentant,
> Qua Beresina nitens praetexit arundine ripas,

---

22 Stanisław Radziwiłł to Krzysztof Radziwiłł, April 28, 1595, Nalibok, *AGAD*, *AR*, dz. V, teka 38, kop. 549.

23 Leon Sapieha to Krzysztof Radziwiłł, January 6, 1595, Warsaw, *AGAD*, *AR*, dz. sygn. 13855, 323–326.

Quosque vetus pascit fortissima corda Polottus.
Qui priscam Gartyna viri, quique aequora Minsci
Lata colunt, Lidamque legunt, Vacamque liquentem,
Erdivilonios et qui (gens Martia) campos,
Qui terras Mohilaee tuas, vicinaque vertunt
Aequora, despectant et quos Orsanscia tecta,
Atque quaterdenis Ozerscia turribus audax,
Fluctus inaccessam late hanc circumsonat undis.
Non ego transierim felics moenia Brestae,
Et priscos tractus, et parvae tecta Recitzae.
Quos Homella viros alit, et quos Moseris, et quos
Duratos pugnis belli videt Oster amoenus.
Quid loquar Osmenios populos? Lastaya legentes
Littora, qui procul hinc flavi Nemenis ad altas
Rura colunt valles, Cobriniaque aequora, pulchrum
Axiacenque bibunt, ubi sunt pinguissima rura.
Egregiis pascit quos agris Mscislaus, et quos
Vla viros, iam tum Moschorum sanguine inundans,
Ossibus humanis campusque Ivanscius albens,
Keystutique necis Crevus vestigia servans:
Slonimiique viri, Volcoviscumque colntes,
Et Russi, et mortem haud metuentes Iazyges, olim
Caniciem galea premere, armis pectora sueti.
Qui vitreae valles exercent vomere Suentae,
Et quos dives apum, et Cereris Samogetia misit,
Volcomeraeque manus, nec non Braslavia pubes.
Multae praeterea gentes, populique feroeces,
Quos tunc Batthorheus magna ditione regebat.[24]

In this poem, the patriotic nominative "Lithuania" denotes the entirety of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania and all of its inhabitants and defenders.

The sources discussed above demonstrate the political nation's powerful awareness of its statehood as well as its patriotism. In sociological terms, the name "Lithuania" may be described as an "ideological homeland" that united a multicultural political nation (in the sense of one that accommodates different

---

24 Quoted from Sigitas Narbutas, *Tradicija ir originalumas Jono Radvano "Radviliadoje"* (Vilnius: Lietuvių literatūros ir tautosakos institutas, 1998), 154–155.

ethnicities). The GDL's conscious patriotic self-awareness as a state did not endure, complicating the development of the Commonwealth's political nation. When the Union of Lublin was declared in 1569, as Jan Dzięgielewski points out, the boyars of the Polish Crown began to identify with the Commonwealth on the same level as they did with their homeland, Poland. However, this presented them with a difficult task. They had to find ways of imparting love of a joint Republic to countries that already had political law, including the GDL, Royal Prussia, and—with the end of the First Northern War—Livonia as well. Lithuania's dukes and magnates, the Ruthenians on a small scale, and even the Prussian elite were wary of a joint state on account of its structure. An important factor in the GDL that made the political nation reluctant to recognize the Commonwealth as its homeland was the "trimming" that had their state had undergone. Lithuania's political elite did not forget the annexation of the Ukrainian palatinates to the Polish Crown and, until the end of the seventeenth century, sought their restitution. However, fear of aggression by Muscovy combined with ever-changing political life in the Republic to vitiate the self-awareness of the GDL's boyars and weaken the zeal of the GDL's magnates to foster the separate status of their state. As Edward Opaliński explains with emphasis, the concept of "Republic" became a synonym for the joint Polish-Lithuanian state in the first decades of the seventeenth century—a state that each citizen was duty-bound to treat with love, dedication, and sacrifices for its greater good. The concept of homeland became ever narrower in the conscious identity of the Republic's boyars in the seventeenth century. Opaliński points out, however, that the military and political crisis of the mid-seventeenth century, which the composite Polish-Lithuanian state survived, again forced them to find new ways to integrate the country's fragmented political community.[25]

It was the notion of freedom, much emphasized in the political rhetoric, that united the political nations of the Kingdom of Poland and the Grand Duchy of Lithuania. Debates over the contents of which freedom figured importantly in the political rhetoric of the early modern period. In the GDL, as Darius Kuolys emphasizes, these discussions were spurred by numerous things—the polemics of Polish and Lithuanian authors on the eve of the 1569 Union of Lublin; ideological arguments with the Muscovites, which escalated in vehemence during the Livonian War; more attention to

---

25 Jan Dzięgielewski, "Od staropolskiego 'miłośnika ojczyzny' do 'sarmackiego patrioty,'" in *Patriotyzm polaków. Studia z historii idei,* ed. Jacek Kloczkowski (*Kraków*. Ośrodek Myśli Politycznej, 2006), 21–31.

the philosophical works of antiquity; and closer dialogue with intellectual life in developed Western Europe.[26] Consequently, Kuolys explains, different understandings of freedom coexisted and intertwined in various ways. The understanding of procedure and self-rule that dominated Lithuanian texts clashed with the dichotomy of freedom and slavery that was brought up in Polish polemic texts. On the eve of the Union of Lublin, these two different rhetorical arguments began to overlap. The goal of broader rights that characterized the GDL's boyars in the second half of the sixteenth century was marked by changes in political rhetoric. Authors from Lithuania began to laud its citizens' rights and freedoms more consistently, creating a unique mythology surrounding the idea of freedom and attempting to present Lithuania to Europe as the best-run state in the world and Lithuanians as a nation that naturally loved liberty. Some sources, however, show that the boyars' libertarian rhetoric and their perception of the state as the guardian of its citizens' freedoms, characteristic of the Kingdom of Poland's political nation, had already begun to gain a foothold in the public sphere of the GDL in the late sixteenth century. This boyar civic identity was strengthened by the mythology of liberty that the GDL's written works concocted, the works of Maciej Strykowski having the biggest impact on its advent. Concurrently, Kuolys adds, the rhetoric on liberty in Lithuania's written oeuvre acquired the character of Lithuanian patriotism and nationalism. The freedoms that were preserved and defended were understood not as a class value or a common civic value but as an expression of the independence of Lithuanians as a nation and state. This interpretation of liberty is characteristic of seventeenth- and eighteenth-century texts from Lithuania and its rhetoric persisted until the Commonwealth met its demise.

The difficult period of the development of the Commonwealth's political nation and its culture, with its ups and downs, continued in the second half of the seventeenth century and into the eighteenth.[27] Its outcome will by necessity be investigated in future research.

---

26   See Darius Kuolys, "Laisvės sampratos XVI a. Lietuvos Didžiosios Kunigaikštystės raštijoje," in *Seminarai*, ed. Alvydas Jokubaitis and Antanas Kulakauskas (Vilnius: Vyturys, 1998), 31–38.

27   See J. Kiaupiene, "500-letnia rocznica unii horodelskiej 1413 roku. Między kulturą polityczną a pamięcią historyczną," *Prace Historyczne* 141, no. 2: *Unia horodelska* (2014): 395–407; Z. Norkus, "Imperial Past of Ancient Lithuanian in the Historical memory of the Modern Independent Lithuania," ibid., 409–433; A. Nowak, "Horodło z perspektywy XX-XXI wieku: Pamięć modernizacji, pamięć republiki, pamięć imperium," ibid., 435–458.

Bibliography

UNPUBLISHED ARCHIVAL SOURCES

AGAD—Archiwum Główne Akt Dawnych w Warszawie / The Central Archives of Historical Records in Warsaw

BJ—Biobblioteka Jagiellońska uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego w Krakowie / Jagiellonian Library of the Jagiellonian University in Kraków

BN—Biblioteka Narodowa w Warszawie / National Library of Poland in Warsaw

BCzart—Biblioteka Książąt Czartoryskich w Krakowie / The Princes Czartoryski Library in Kraków

BNPAU—Biblioteka Naukowa Polskiej Akademii Umiejętności i Polskiej Akademii Nauk w Krakowie / The Scientific Library of the PAAS and the PAS in Kraków

BUW—Biblioteka Uniwersytecka w Warszawie / University of Warsaw Library

Ossl.—Biblioteka Zakładu Narodowego im. Ossolińskich Polskiej Akademii Nauk we Wrocławiu / Ossolineum Library in Wrocław

LMAVB—Lietuvos mokslų akademijos Vrublevskių biblioteka Vilniuje / The Wroblewski Library of the Lithuanian Academy of Sciences in Vilnius

HHSta—Österreichisches Staatsarchiv. Haus-, Hof- und Staatsarchiv, Wien / The Austrian State Archives in Vienna

VUB—Vilniaus universiteto biblioteka Vilniuje / Vilnius University Library in Vilnius

RGADA—Rossiiskii gosudarstvennyi arkhiv drevnikh aktov (Moscow) / Russian State Archives of Early Acts (Moscow)

RNB—Rossiiskaia natsional'naia biblioteka (Sankt Peterburg) / The National Library of Russia (Saint Petersburg)

WB—Lietuvos Mokslų Akademijos Vrublevskių Biblioteka / The Wroblewski Library of the Lithuanian Academy of Sciences.

SOURCE PUBLICATIONS EQUIPPED WITH PROFESSIONAL COMMENTARIES, COLLECTED DOCUMENTS, AND ANTHOLOGIES

Acta Tomiciana, vol. 7. Edited by Tytus Działyński. Poznań: Biblioteka Kórnicka, 1859.

Akta unji Polski z Litwą, 1385–1791. Edited by Stanisław Kutrzeba and Władysław Semkowicz. Kraków: Polska Akademia Umiejętności, 1932.

Akta zjazdów stanów Wielkiego Księstwa Litewskiego, vol. 1: *Okresy bezkrólewi (1572–1586, 1586–1587, 1632, 1648, 1696–1697, 1706–1709, 1733–1735, 1763–1764)*. Edited by Henryk Lulewicz. Warsaw: Neriton, 2006.

Akta zjazdów stanów Wielkiego Księstwa Litewskiego, vol. 2: *Okresy panowań królów elekcyjnych, XVI-XVII wiek*. Edited by Henryk Lulewicz. Warsaw: Neriton, 2009.

"Albertas Goštautas, Vilniaus vaivada, Bonai Sforcai, Lenkijos karalienei, prieš kunigaikštį Konstantiną Ostrogiškį ir prieš Radvilus." Translated by Eugenija Ulčinaitė, edited by Rimantas Jasas. In *Šešioliktojo amžiaus raštija*, vol. 5 of *Senoji Lietuvos literatūra*, edited by Sigitas Narbutas, 31–54. Vilnius: Pradai, 2000.

Anonim. "Treny nagrobne zacnie urodzonym młodzięcom: ...Panu Olbrychtowi pokojowemu K[róla] Je[go] M[ości], i ... P[anu] Janowi Malcherowi, ... P[ana] Aleksandra Radzimińskiego z ziemie żmodzkiej stolnika synom w drodrze będącym , a w Mosiadach, w miasteczku biskupstwa żmojdzkiego, ... morderstwem z tego świata w niewinności zgładzonych w roku 1616, 27 dnia septembra...." In *Polska siedemnastowieczna literatura okolicznościowa ze zbiorów zamku Skokloster*, edited by Sławomir Baczewski, Dariusz Chemperek and Janusz S. Gruchała, 38–53. Warsaw: Neriton, 2009.

Archiwum domu Radziwiłłów: *Listy ks. M. K. Radziwiłła Sierotki, Jana Zamojskiego. Lwa Sapiehy*. Edited by A. Sokołowski. Kraków, 1885.

Archiwum domu Sapiehów, vol. 1: *Listy z lat 1575–1606*. Edited by A. Prochaska. Lviv, 1892.

Archiwum Jana Zamojskiego, kanclerza i hetmana wielkiego Koronnego, vol. 1: *1553–1579*. Edited by Wacław Sobieski. Warsaw: nakł. Maurycego Zamoyskiego, 1904.

Archiwum Komisji Prawniczej, vol. 7, part 1: *Pomniki prawa litewskiego z XVI wieku*. Edited by Tytus Działyński. Kraków: Polska Akademia Umiejętności, 1900.

Archiwum XX Sanguszków w Sławucie, vol. 2 of *Dyplomataryusz gałęzi Niesuchojeżskiej*, parts 1–7. Edited by Zygmunt Luba Radzimiński and Bronisław Gorczak. Lviv: J. Tarnowski, 1887–1910.

Daugirdas, Samuelis. *Genealogija, arba trumpas didžiųjų kunigaikščių ir jų didžių bei narsių karo žygių aprašymas, kadaise Motiejaus Strijkovskio sukurtas, o dabar vėl išleistas Samuelio Daugirdo iš Paguojo*. Edited by Sigitas Narbutas and Kęstutis Gudmantas. Translated from Polish by Regina Koženiauskienė. Vilnius: Lietuvių literatūros ir tautosakos institutas, 2001.

Diariusz konwokacji senatu w Lublinie z sierpnia 1584 roku. Edited by Ewa Dubas-Urwanowicz. *Białostockie Teki Historyczne* 8 (2010): 193–205.

Diariusz poselstwa Polskiego do Francji po Henryka Walezego w 1573 roku. Edited by Adam Przyboś and Roman Żelewski. Wrocław: Zakład Narodowy im. Ossolińskich, 1963.

Dnevnik Liublinskogo seima 1569 goda. Soedinenie Velikogo kniazhestva Litovskogo s Korolevstvom Pol´skim. Saint Petersburg: V. Golovin, 1869.

Dyplomaci w dawnych czasach. Relacje staropolskie z XVI-XVIII stulecia. Edited by Adam Przybosz and Roman Żelewski. Kraków: Wydawnictwo Literackie, 1959.

Gradovius, Franciscus. *Hodoeporicon Moschicum illustrissimi principis ac Domini Christophori Radivvilonis....* Vilnius: Daniel Lenczycki, 1582.

Herburt, Jan. *Statuta Regni Polonae in ordinem alphabeti digesta*. Kraków, 1563.

_____. *Statuta y Przywileje Koronne z lacińskiego języka na polskie przełożone y spisane*. Kraków: M. Szaffenberg, 1570.

Januszowski, Jan. *Statuta Prawa y Constitucie Koronne łacińskie y polskie z Statutów Łaskiego y Herborta z Constituciy Koronnych zebrane, y na ksiąg dziesięcioro, części, tytuły, prawa y paragraphy ... spisane, sporządzone i wydane*. Kraków: Drukarnia Łazarzowa, 1600.

Jevlašauskis, Teodoras. *Atsiminimai*. Edited by Darius Vilimas. Translated from Old Slavs by Neringa Pranckevičiūtė-Lūžienė. Vilnius: Lietuvių literatūros ir tautosakos institutas, 1998.

"Kolęda, która Wielmożnemu Panu Jego Mości Panu Janowi Denhoffowi, pułkownikowi J[ego] K[rólewskiej] M[ości] wiskiemu, wąsoskiemu ekonomowi, dzierżawcy orzechowskiemu etc., etc. Rodzicom Wielce Miłościwym ofiarują synowie najpowolniejszy Jan i Krzysztof Denhoffowie akademicy wileńscy." In *Polska siedemnastowieczna literatūra okolicznościowa ze zbiorów zamku Skokloster*, edited by Sławomir Baczewski, Dariusz Chemperek, and Janusz S. Gruchała, 100–106, 166–171. Warsaw: Neriton, 2009.

Kalbų varžybos / Competition of Languages / Koncert Języków: *Lietuvos Didžiosios Kunigaikštystės valdovų ir didikų sveikinimai / The Ceremonial Greetings of the Grand Duchy of Lithuanian's Rulers and Nobles / Pozdrowienia władców i magnatów Wielkiego Księstwa Litewskiego*. Edited by Eugenija Ulčinaitė. Vilnius: Nacionalinis muziejus Lietuvos Didžiosios Kunigaikštystės valdovų rūmai, 2010.

Kojalavičius-Vijūkas, Albertas (as Wiiuk Koialowicz, Alberto). *Historiae Lituanae pars prior: De rebus Lituanorum ante susceptan Christianam religionem coniunctionemque Magni Lithuaniae Ducatus cum Regno Poloniae libri novem. Auctore P. Alberto Wiiuk Koialowicz, Soc. Iesu S. T. H. D.* Dantisci: Sumptibus Georgii Färsteri, 1650.

———. (as Wiiuk Koialowicz, Alberto). *Historiae Lituanae a coniunctione Magni Ducatus cum Regno Poloniae ad unionem eorum dominiorum libri octo, auctore Alberto Wiiuk Koialowicz, Societatis Iesu S. Theologiae doctore.* Antverpiae: Jacobus Meursius, 1669.

———. *Lietuvos istorija*. Translated from Latin by Leonas Valkūnas. Preface and commentaries by Juozas Jurginis. Vilnius: Vaga, 1988.

———. *Lietuvos istorijos įvairenybės*, part 1. Edited by Darius Kuolys. Translated from Latin by Darius Antanavičius and Sigitas Narbutas. Vilnius: Lietuvių literatūros ir tautosakos institutas, 2003.

———. *Lietuvos istorijos įvairenybės*, part 2. Edited by Darius Kuolys. Translated from Latin by Rasa Jurgelėnaitė. Vilnius: Lietuvių literatūros ir tautosakos institutas, 2004.

———. *Šventasis Lietuvos Didžiosios Kunigaikštijos bei jai priklausančių provincijų giminių ir herbų vardynas*. Translated from Latin by Sigitas Narbutas. Vilnius: Lietuvos mokslų akademijos Vrublevskių biblioteka, 2015.

Krzysztofa Warszewickiego i Anonima uwagi o wolności szlacheckiej. Edited by Krzysztof Koehler. Kraków: Wydawnictwo WAM, 2010.

Łaski, Jan. *Commune incliti Poloniae Regni privilegium constitutionum et indultum publicitus decretorum approboratumque.* Kraków, 1506.

Lietuvis, Mykolas (as Lituani, Michalonis). *De moribus tartarorum, lituanorum et Moschorum. Fragmina X, multiplici historia referta.* Basle: Conrad Waldkirch, 1615.

———. *Apie totorių, lietuvių ir maskvėnų papročius. Dešimt įvairausistorinio turinio fragmentų.* Translated from Latin to Lithuanian by Ignas Jonynas. Vilnius: Vaga, 1966.

Lietuvos Didžiosios Kunigaikštystės ir Maskvos valstybės sutartys. 1449–1556 metai. Edited by Marius Sirutavičius. Vilnius: Versus aureus, 2016.

Lietuvos metraštis. Bychovco kronika. Edited by Rimantas Jasas. Vilnius, 1971.

Lietuvos metrika. Užrašymų knyga 7 (1506–1539). Edited by Inga Ilarienė, Laimontas Karalius, and Darius Antanavičius. Vilnius: Lietuvos istorijos instituto leidykla, 2011.

Lietuvos Metrika, Užrašymų knyga 15 (1528–1538). Edited by Artūras Dubonis. Vilnius: Žara, 2002.

Lietuvos metrika. Užrašymų knyga 25 (1387–1546). Edited by Darius Antanavičius and Algirdas Baliulis. Vilnius: Mokslo ir enciklopedijų leidybos institutas, 1998.

Listy króla Zygmunta Augusta do Radziwiłłów. Edited by Irena Kanewska. Kraków: Wydawnictwo Literackie, 1997.

Michałowski, Jakub. *Jakuba Michałowskiego, wojskiego Lubelskiego a póżnej kasztela Bieckiego, Księga pamiętnicza, z dawnego rękopisa będącego własnośią Ludwika Hr. Morsztyna.* Kraków: C. K. Towarzystwo naukowe Krakowskie, 1864.

Nihil novi. Z dorobku sejmu radomskiego 1505 roku, vol. I: *Wstęp historyczny,* by Andrzej Szymanek; vol. II: *Materiały źródłowe.* Translated by Henryk Wójtowicz. Radom: Stowarzyszenie Anno Domini, 2005.

Nowiny lubelskie, Lublin, March 6, 1569.

Palczowski, Jan. *Ustawy prawa polskiego napotrzebniejsze krotko z lacinskich wybrane na polski język dla wszelkiego człowieka prostego a prawo wiedzieć potrzebuiącego przełoóone.* Manuscript, 1555. First published in Brzeć Litewski: Murmelius Stanisław, 1560.

Pielgrzymowski, Eliasz (as Pilgrimovius, Helias). *Panegyrica Apostrophe ad Christophorum Radivilum.* Kraków: Andrea Petricovius, 1583.

_____. (as Pilgrimovijus, Elijas). *Didžioji Leono Sapiegos pasiuntinybė į Maskvą, 1600–1601.* Edited by Jūratė Kiaupienė. Vilnius: Žara, 2002.

_____. *Poselstwo i krótkie spisanie rozprawy z Moskwą. Poselstwo do Zygmunta Trzeciego.* Edited by Roman Krzywy, Dariusz Chemperek, and Janusz Gruchała. Warsaw. Neriton, 2010.

_____. *Apostrofa panegiriczna.* Edited and translated from Latin by Bartosz Awianowicz. Warsaw: Neriton, 2012.

Pirmasis Lietuvos Statutas. Edited by Edvardas Gudavičius. Vilnius: Artlora, 2014.

Pisma polityczne z czasów pierwszego bezkrolewia. Edited by Jan Czubek. Kraków: Akademja Umiejętności, 1906.

Polnoe sobranie russkikh letopisei, vol. 32: "Khronika Litovskaia i Zhomoitskaia," "Khronika Bykhovtsa," "Letopis´ Barkulabovskaia," "Letopis´ Averki," "Letopis´ Pancyrnogo." Moscow: Nauka, 1975.

Polnoe sobranie russkikh letopisei, vol. 35: "Letopisi Belorussko-Litovskiie." Edited by Nikolai Ulashchik. Moscow: Nauka, 1980.

"Ponui Steponui, iš Dievo malonės Lenkijos karaliui, Lietuvos didžiajam kunigaikščiui, Rusijos, Prūsijos, Žemaitijos, Mazovijos, Livonijos, Voluinės, Polesės, Transilvanijos valdovui ir maloniausiajam Ponui." In *Šešioliktojo amžiaus raštija,* vol. 5 of *Senoji Lietuvos literatūra,* edited by Sigitas Narbutas, 276–277. Vilnius: Pradai, 2000.

Przyłuski, Jakub. *Leges seu statuta ac Privilegia Regni Poloniae omnia....* Kraków, 1553.

Quincunx, to jest wzór Korony Polskiej na cynku wystawiony przez Stanisława Orzechowskiego Okszyca z przemyskiej ziemi i za kolędę poslom koronnym do Warszawy na nowe lato roku pańskiego 1564 poslany. Kraków: Drukarnia Łazarzowa, 1564.

Radziwiłł, Albrycht Stanisław. *Memoriale Rerum Gestarum in Polonia 1632–1656*, vol. 1: *1632–1633.* Edited by Adam Przyboś and Roman Żelewski. Warsaw: Zakład Narodowy im. Ossolińskich; Wydawnictwo Polskiej Akademii Nauk, 1968.

_____. *Memoriale Rerum Gestarum in Polonia 1632–1656*, vol. 2: *1634–1639.* Edited by Adam Przyboś and Roman Żelewski. Warsaw: Zakład Narodowy im. Ossolińskich; Wydawnictwo Polskiej Akademii Nauk, 1970.

_____. *Memoriale Rerum Gestarum in Polonia 1632–1656*, vol. 3: *1640–1647.* Edited by Adam Przyboś and Roman Żelewski. Warsaw: Zakład Narodowy im. Ossolińskich; Wydawnictwo Polskiej Akademii Nauk, 1972.

_____. *Memoriale Rerum Gestarum in Polonia 1632–1656*, vol. 4: *1648–1656.* Edited by Adam Przyboś and Roman Żelewski. Warsaw: Zakład Narodowy im. Ossolińskich; Wydawnictwo Polskiej Akademii Nauk, 1974.

_____. *Memoriale Rerum Gestarum in Polonia 1632–1656*, vol. 5: *Index.* Edited by Adam Przyboś and Roman Żelewski. Warsaw: Zakład Narodowy im. Ossolińskich; Wydawnictwo Polskiej Akademii Nauk, 1975.

_____. *Pamiętnik o dziejach w Polsce*, vol. 1: *1632–1636*, vol. 2: *1637–1646*, vol. 3: *1647–1656.* Translated and edited by Adam Przyboś and Roman Żelewski. Warsaw: Panstwowy Instytut Wydawniczy, 1980.

Radvanas, Jonas (as Radvanus, Ioannus). *Epithalamium in nuptias Illustrissimi ac magnifici domini d. Christophorin Monvidi Dorohostayski, Magni Ducatus Lituaniae incisoris, ... et generosiss ac illustris virginis d. Sopphiae Chodkieviciae. . . .* Vilnius: Salomonis Syltzeri, 1588.

_____. (as Radvanus, Ioannus). *Radivilias sive de vita et rebus praeclarissime gestis immortalis memoriae illustrissimii principis Nicolai Radivili Georgii fillii, ducis in Dubinki ac Bierże, palatini Vilnensis etc ac exercitruum fortissimi etc libri quator. . . . Addite est oratio funebris gnerosi domini Andrea Volani . . . et quorundum auctorum epigrammata.* First published in Vilnius, 1585.

_____. *Radviliada.* Compiled, introductory article, commentaries and list of persons by Sigitas Narbutas. Translated from Latin to Lithiuanian by Sigitas Narbutas. Vilnius: Vaga, 1997.

"Rozmowa Polaka z Litwinem / z ktorej tu snadnie kazdy obaczyć moze co jest prawa wolność / abo swoboda / i jakoby unią Korona Polska z Księstwem Litewskim przyjąć miała / przeciw sromotnemu i omylnemu Stanisława Orzechowskiego pisaniu / ktorym niewinnie sławne Księstwo Litewskie zelzyć chciał / uczyniona." Edited by Regina Koženiauskienė. In *Šešioliktojo amžiaus raštija*, vol. 5 of *Senoji Lietuvos literatūra*, edited by Sigitas Narbutas, 201–275. Vilnius: Pradai, 2000.

Rozmowa Polaka z Litwinem, 1564. Edited by Józef Korzeniowski. Kraków: Wydawnictwa Akademii Umiejętności, 1890.

Rejestry popisowe pospolitego ruszenia szlachty Wielkiego Księstwa Litewskiego z 1621 r. Edited by Andrzej Rachuba. Warsaw: DiG, 2015.

Russkaia istoricheskaia biblioteka, vol. 13: *Pamiatniki drevnei russkoi pis′mennosti, otnosiashchiesia k Smutnomu vremeni*. Saint Petersburg, 1891.

Rymsza, Andreas. *ΔΕΚΕΤΗΡΟΣ ΑΚΡΟΑΜΑ, to iest dziesięćroczna powieść wojennych spraw Oświeconego księcia Krzysztofa Radziwiła*. Vilnius: Daniel Lenczycki, 1585.

Sarnicki, Stanisław. *Statuta y Metrika Przywileiow Koronnych, Iężykiem Polskim Spisane*. Kraków: Drukarnia Łazarzowa, 1594.

Skarga, Piotr. *Kazania sejmowe*. Edited by Janusz Tazbir, in collaboration with Mirosław Korolko. Wrocław: Zakład Narodowy im. Ossolińskich, 2008.

―――――. (as Skarga, Petras). *Seimo pamokslai. Kvietimas atgailauti Lenkijos Karalystės ir Lietuvos Didžiosios Kunigaikštystės piliečiams*. Edited by Viktorija Vaitkevičiūtė. Vilnius: Lietuvių literatūros ir tautosakos institutas, 2014.

Stanisława Orzechowskiego i Augustyna Rotundosa deba o Rzeczypospolitej. Edited by Krysztof Koehler. Kraków: Wydawnictwo WAM, 2009.

Stryjkowski, Maciej. *Kronika polska, litewska, żmodzka i wszystkiej Rusi Macieja Stryjkowskiego*, vol. 1-2. Warsaw, 1846.

―――――. *O początkach, wywodach, dzielnościach, sprawach rycerskich i domowych sławnego narodu litewskiego, żemojdzkiego i ruskiego, przedtym nigdy od żadnego ani kuszone, ani opisane, z natchnienia Bożego a uprzejmie pilnego doświadczenia*. Edited by Julia Radziszewska. Warsaw: Państwowy Instytut Wydawniczy, 1978.

The Lithuanian Statute of 1529. Edited and translated by Karl von Loewe. Leiden: Brill, 1976.

"Treny nagrobne zacnie urodzonym młodzieńcom: Je[go] Mości Panu Olbrychtowi pokojowemu K[róla] Je[go] M[ości] i J[ego] P[anu] Janowi Malcherowi, i J[ego] M[ości] P[ana] Aleksandra Radzimińskiego z ziemie żmodzkiej stolnika synom w drodze będącym, a w Masiadach, w miasteczku biskupstwa żmojdzkiego, z rankoru dawnego zawziętego tak urzędnika i księdza same[g]o, jako i mieszczan i poddanych masiadskich, nowym, okrutnym i niesłychanym morderstwem z tego świata w niewinności zgładzonym w roku 1616, 27 dnia septembra, w dzień ś[więtego] Stanisława." In *Polska siedemnastowieczna literatura okolicznościowa ze zbiorów zamku Skokloster*, edited by Sławomir Baczewski, Dariusz Chemperek, and Janusz S. Gruchała, 38–53. Warsaw: Neriton, 2009.

Triumfo diena. 1611 m. birželio 13 d. Smolensko pergalė ir iškilmingas Zigmanto Vazos sutikimas Vilniuje 1611 m. liepos 24 d. / Dies Triumphi. Victoria Sigismundi III die XIII Junii A.D. MDCXI Smolensko expugnato et triumphalis ingressus Vilnam die XXIV Julii A.D. MDCXI celebratus. Text compilation by Eugenija Ulčinaitė and Eugenijus Saviščevas. Vilnius: Nacionalinis muziejus Lietuvos Didžiosios Kunigaikštystės valdovų rūmai, 2011.

Valentino Saurmano laiškai imperatoriui Ferdinandui I iš Žygimanto Augusto Vilniaus dvaro (1561– 1562 m.). Edited by Darius Antanavičius, Vilija Gerulaitienė, and Jūratė Kiaupienė. Vilnius: Pilių tyrimo centras "Lietuvos pilys," 2009.

Volanas, Andrius. *Rinktiniai raštai*. Vilnius: Mokslo ir enciklopedijų leidykla, 1996.

Volumina constitutionum, part 1: *1493–1549*, vol. 1: *1493–1526*. Edited by Stanisław Grodziski, Irena Dwornicka, and Wacław Uruszczak. Warsaw: Wydawnictwo Sejmowe, 1996.

Volumina constitutionum, part 2: *1550–1609*, vol. 1: *1550–1585*. Edited by Stanisław Grodziski, Irena Dwornicka, and Wacław Uruszczak. Warsaw: Wydawnictwo Sejmowe, 2005.

Źródłopisma do dziejów Unii Korony Polskiej i W. X. Litewskiego, part 2, section 1. Edited by Adam Tytus Działyński. Poznań: Ludwik Merzbach, 1861.

Žemaitijos žemės privilegijos XV-XVIII a. Edited by Darius Antanavičius and Eugenijus Saviščevas. Vilius: Versus Aureus, 2010.

XVI amžiaus Lietuvos ir Lenkijos politinės kultūros šaltiniai (1562 metų tekstai). Edited by Jūratė Kiaupienė. Vilnius: Eugrimas, 2008.

1385 m. rugpjūčio 14 d. Krėvos aktas. Edited by Jūratė Kiaupienė, S. C. Rowell, Edmundas Rimša, Rūta Čapaitė, and Eugenija Ulčinaitė. Vilnius: Žara, 2002.

1413 metų Horodlės aktai (Dokumentai ir tyrinėjimai) / Akty horodelskie z 1413 roku (Dokumenty i studia). Edited by Jūratė Kiaupienę, Lidia Korczak, Piotr Rabiej, Edmundas Rimša, and Jan Wroniszewski. Vilnius: Lietuvos istorijos instituto leidykla, 2013.

440 lat Unii Polsko-Litewskiej / 440 metų lenkijos-Lietuvos Unijai. Edited by Alfredas Bumblauskas. Warsaw: Galeria Polskiej Książki, 2009.

STUDIES

Adamson, John, ed. *The Princely Courts of Europe: Ritual, Politics and Culture under Ancien Regime (1500–1750)*. London: Seven Dials, 2000.

Ališauskas, Vytautas. "Mitologija ir politika: Vilniaus įkūrimo mitas kaip politinis pasakojimas." In *Naujausi lituanistikos atradimai ir šiuolaikin istorinė vaizduotė*, vol. 37 of *Senoji Lietuvos literatūra*, edited by Živilė Nedzinskaitė, 15–66. Vilnius: Lietuvių literatūros ir tautosakos institutas, 2014.

Almond, Gabriel A., and Sidney Verba. *The Civic Culture. Political attitudes and democracy in five nations*. Princeton, NJ: University of Princeton Press, 1963.

Ambroziak, Tomasz. "The Necessity to Reexamine the Question of Lithuanian Particularism during the Reign of Sigismund III and Władysław IV." *Zapiski Historyczne* 79, no. 4 (2014): 89–109.

Ankersmit, Frank R. "The Sublime Dissociation of the Past. Or How to Be(come) What One Is No Longer." *History and Theory* 40, no. 3 (October 2001): 295–323.

Antoniewicz, Marceli. "Rodowód książąt Radziwiłłów w dziełach Alberta Wijuka Kojałowicza." In *Albertas Vijūkas-Kojalavičius iš 400 metų perspektyvos*, vol. 27 of *Senoji Lietuvos literatūra*, edited by Sigitas Narbutas, 181–214. Vilnius: Mokslo ir Enciklopedijų Leidykla, 2009.

———. *Protoplaści książąt Radziwiłłów. Dzieje mitu i meandry historiografii*. Warsaw: DiG, 2011.

Assmann, Jan. *Das kulturelle Gedächtnis. Schrift, Erinnerung und politische Identität in frühen Hochkulturen*. Munich: C. H. Beck, 2007.

Assmann, Aleida. *Erinnerungsräume. Formen und Wandlungen des kulturellen Gedächtnisses*. Munich: C. H. Beck, 2006.

Axer, Jerzy, ed. *Łacina jako język elit*. Warsaw: DiG, 2004.

Augustyniak, Urszula. "Duchowni klienci Krzysztofa II Radziwiłła. Kondycja i funkcje duchowieństwa ewangelicko-reformowanego w dobrach Radziwiłłowskich w pierwszej połowie XVII wieku." *Miscellanea historico-archivistica* 3: *Radziwiłłowie XVI-XVIII wieku: W kręgu polityki i kultury* (1989): 159–173.

_____. *Wazowie i "królowie rodacy". Studium władzy królewskiej w Rzeczypospolitej XVII wieku*. Warsaw: Semper, 1999.

_____. "Kancelaria Radziwiłłów Birżańskich w XVII w.—oragnizacja i funkcionowanie." In *Miscellanea historico-archivistica* 11 (2000): 11–23.

_____. "Specyfika patronatu magnackiego w Wielkim Księstwie Litewskim w XVII wieku. Problemy badawcze." *Kwartalnik Historyczny* 109, no. 1 (2002): 97–110.

_____. "Polska i łacińska terminologia ustrojowa w publicystyce politycznej epoki Wazów." In *Łacina jako język elit*, edited by Jerzy Axer, 33–72. Warsaw: DiG, 2004.

_____. "Granice wolności obywatela Rzeczypospolitej w XVI-XVII wieku. Jednostka wobec władzy, prawa i społeczeństwa." In *Wolność i jej granice. Polskie dylematy*, edited by Jacek Kloczkowski, 13–36. Kraków: Ośrodek Myśli Politycznej, 2007.

_____. "Ideologia polityczna ewangelików litewskich w czasach dwu pierwszych Wazów." In *Lietuvos Didžiosios Kunigaikštystės istorijos kraštovaizdis. Mokslinių straipsnių rinkinys. Skiriama profesorės Jūratės Kiaupienės 65-mečiui*, edited by Ramunė Šmigelskytė-Stukienė, 345–368. Vilnius: 2012.

_____. *History of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth. State—Society—Culture*. Edited by Iwo Hryniewicz. Translated by Grażyna Waluga and Dorota Sobstel. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 2015.

Augustyniak, Urszula, ed. *Środowiska kulturotwórcze i kontakty kulturalne Wielkiego Księstwa Litewskiego od XV do XIX wieku*. Warsaw: Neriton, 2009.

Avižonis, Konstantinas. *Rinktiniai raštai*, vol. 1: *Bajorai valstybiniame Lietuvos gyvenime Vazų laikais*. Rome: Lietuvių Katalikų Mokslo Akademija, 1975.

Baczewski, Sławomir. *Szlachectwo. Studium z dziejów idei w pismiennictwie polskim. Druga połowa XVI wieku—XVII wiek*. Lublin: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Marii Curie-Skłodowskiej, 2009.

Baczkowski, Krzysztof, and Janusz Smołucha, eds. *Europa Środkowowschodnia od X do XVIII wieku—jedność czy różnorodność?* Kraków: Societas Vistulana, 2005.

Bak, János M., ed. *Coronations. Medieval and Early Modern Monarchie Ritual*. Berkley, CA: University of California Press, 1990.

Baldwin, Geoffery P. "The translation of political theory in early modern Europe." In *Cultural Translation in Early Modern Europe*, edited by Peter Burke and R. Po-Chia Hsia, 101–124. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007.

Banionis, Egidijus. *Lietuvos Didžiosios Kunigaikštystės pasiuntinių tarnyba XV-XVI amžiais*, edited by Zigmantas Kiaupa and Žydrūnas Mačiukas. Vilnius: Diemedžio leidykla, 1998.

Baniulytė, Aušra. "Pacai ar *Pazzi*? Nauja Palemono legendos versija LDK raštijoje." In *Istorijos rašymo horizontai*, vol. 18 of *Senoji Lietuvos literatūra*, edited by Aušra Jurgutienė, 140–168. Vilnius: Lietuvių literatūros ir tautosakos institutas, 2005.

Bardach, Juliusz. "Statuty litewskie w ich kręgu prawno-kulturowym." In Juliusz Bardach, *O dawnej i niedawnej Litwie*, 9–71. Poznań: Wydawnictwo Naukowe UAM, 1988.

_____. "Litewskość w państwowości i systemie prawa Wielkiego Księstwa w XVI-XVIII stuleciach." In *Tarp istorijos ir būtovės. Studijos prof. Edvardo Gudavičiaus 70-mečiui*, edited by Alfredas Bumblauskas and Rimvydas Petrauskas, 349–366. Vilnius: Aidai, 1999.

_____. *Themis a Clio czyli prawo a historia*. Warsaw: Liber, 2001.

Baronas, Darius, and Rowell S. C. *The Conversion of Lithuania. From Pagan Barbarians to Late Medieval Christians*. Vilnius: Institute of Lithuanian Literature and Folklore, 2015.

Bednarczuk, Leszek. "Rzeczpospolita ilu narodów? Określenia wspólnego państwa w aktach unii lubelskiej." In *Polszyzna i inne języki*, edited by Anna Bochnakowa, Leszek Bednarczuk, and Jadwiga Waniakowa, 61–75. Kraków: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego, 2009.

_____. *Językowy obraz Wielkiego Księstwa Litewskiego*: *Millennium Lithuaniae*. Kraków: Lexis, 2010.

Bender, Barbara, ed. *Landscape. Politics and Perspectives*. Oxford: Berg Publishers, 1993.

Berek, Mathias. *Kollektives Gedächtnis und die gesellschaftliche Konstruktion der Wirklichkeit. Eine Theorie der Erinnerungskulturen*. Wiesbaden: Harrasowitz Verlag, 2009.

Beresnevičius, Gintaras. *Palemono mazgas. Palemono legendo speriferinis turinys*. Religinė istorinė studija. Vilnius: Sapnų sala, 2003.

Berman, Harold J. *Law and Revolution. The formation of the Western Legal Tradition*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1983.

Biržiška, Vaclovas. *Lietuvos studentai užsienio universitetuose XIV-XVIII amžiais*. Edited and supplemented by Mykolas Biržiška. Introduction by Adolfas Šapoka. Chicago, IL: Lituanistikos instituto leidykla, 1987.

Błaszczyk, Grzegorz. "Zagadnienia kulturalne w unii polsko-litewskiej (1385–1569)." In *Kultura Litwy i Polski w dziejach. Tożsamość i współistnienie*, 31–49. Kraków: Międzynarodowe Centrum Kultury, 2000.

_____. *Dzieje stosunków polsko-litewskich w latach 1569–1795*, vol. 2: *Od Krewa do Lublina*, part 1. Poznań: Wydawnictwo Poznańskie, 2007.

_____. "Unia polsko-litewska w latach 1569–1795." In *Unia w Horodle na tle stosunków polsko-litewskich: Od Krewa do Zaręczenia wzajemnego Obojga Narodów*, edited by Sławomir Górzyński, 285–296. Warsaw: DiG, 2015.

Bloockmans, Wim, André Holenstein, and Jon Mathieu in collaboration with Daniel Schläppi, eds. *Empowering Interactions. Political Cultures and the Emergence of the State in Europe 1300–1900*. Farnham: Ashgate, 2009.

Bömelburg, Hans-Jürgen. *Frühneuzeitliche Nationen im östlichen Europa. Das polnische Geschichtsdenken und die Reichweite einer humanistischen Nationgeschichte (1500–1700)*. Wiesbaden: Harrasowicz Verlag, 2006.

_____. "Polnische Freiheit—Zur Konstruktion und Reichweite eines frühneuzeitlichen Mobilisierungsbegriffs." In *Kollektive Freiheitsvorstllungen im frühneuzeitlichen Europa (1400–1850)*, edited by Georg Schmidt, Martin van Gelderen, and Christopher Snigula, 191–222. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang Europäisscher Verlag der Wissenschaften, 2006.

_____. *Polska myśl historyczna a humanistyncza historia narodowa (1500–1700)*. Translated by Zdizsław Owczarek, introduction by Andreas Lawaty. Kraków: Universitas, 2011.

Bork Piotr, ed. *Z dziejów staropolskiego pamiętnikarstwa: Przekroje i zbliżenia*. Kraków: Collegium Columbinum, 2012.

Borkowska-Bagieńska, Ewa. "O pożytkach badań nad kulturą prawną." In *Przez tysiąclecia: państwo—prawo—jednostka*, vol. 3, edited by Adam Lityński and Marian Mikołajczyk, 28–40. Katowice: Uniwersytet Śląski, 2001.

Bucevičiūtė, Laima. "Heraldiniai simboliai XVI-XVIII a. kartografijoje: Lietuvos valstybingumo trajektorijos." In *Ministri historiae. Pagalbiniai istorijos mokslai Lietuvos Didžiosios Kunigaikštystės tyrimuose. Mokslinių straipsnių rinkinys, skirtas Edmundo Antano Rimšos 65-mečio sukakčiai*, edited by Zigmantas Kiaupa and Jolita Sarcevičienė, 363–377. Vilnius: Lietuvos istorijos instituto leidykla, 2013.

_____. *Lietuvos Didžioji Kunigaikštystė XV-XVI a.: valstybinės erdvės ir jos sienų samprata*. Vilnius: Versus aureus, 2015.

Bumblauskas, Alfredas, Zenonas Butkus et al. *Alma Mater Vilnensis: Vilniaus universiteto istorijos bruožai*. Vilnius: Vilniaus universiteto leidykla, 2009.

Bumblauskas, Alfredas, and Grigorijus Potašenko, eds. *Lietuvos Didžiosios Kunigaikštijos tradicija ir tautiniai naratyvai*. Vilnius: Vilniaus universiteto leidykla, 2009.

Burke, Peter. *Languages and Communities in Early Modern Europe*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004.

Bues, Almut. "The Formation of the Polish-Lithuanian Monarchy in the Sixteenth Century." In *The Polish-Lithuanian Monarchy in European Context, c. 1500–1795*, edited by Richard Butterwick, 58–81. London: Palgrave, 2001.

Butrimas, Adomas, Vladas Žulkus, Alvydas Nikžentaitis, Vacys Vaivada, and Egidijus Aleksandravičius. *Žemaitijos istorija*. Vilnius: Regnum fondas, 1997.

Bylina, Stanisław, and Jaroslav Pánek. "Political Culture in the Middle Ages and the Early Modern Era (until the End of the 18th Century): An Introduction. In *Political Culture in Central Europe (10th—20th Century)*, volume 1: *Middle Ages and Early Modern Era*, edited by Halina Manikowska and Jaroslav Pánek in cooperation with Martin Holý, 13–27. Prague: Historický ústav Akademie věd, 2005.

Čelkis, Tomas. *Lietuvos Didžiosios Kunigaikštystės teritorija: sienų samprata ir delimitaciniai procesai XIV-XVI amžiuje*. Vilnius: Vilniaus universiteto mokslinė leidykla, 2014.

Cieński, Marcin, ed. *Humanizm polski i wspólnoty. Naród, społeczeństwo, państwo, Europa*. Warsaw: Neriton, 2010.

Ciesielski, Tomasz, and Anna Filipczak–Kocur, eds. *Rzeczpospolita państwem wielu narodówości i wyznań. XVI–XVIII wiek*. Warsaw: DiG, 2008.

Chilton, Stephen. *Grounding Political Development*. Minnesota: University of Minnesota, 2005. Accessed August 14, 2014. http://www.d.umn.edu/~ schilton/Articles/GPD.html.

Chłapowski, Krzysztof. *Elita senatorsko-dygnitarska Korony za czasów Zygmunta III i Władysława IV*. Warsaw: Wydawnictwo sejmowe, 1996.

Choińska-Mika, Jolanta. "Jako miłujący tej Ojczyzny synowie—kilka uwag o staropolskim patriotyzmie." In *Patriotyzm polaków. Studia z historii idei*, edited by Jacek Kloczkowski, 13–20. Kraków: Ośrodek Mysli Politycznej, 2006.

Chomik, Piotr, ed. *Kościół prawosławny w dziejach Rzeczypospolitej i krajów sąsiednich.* Białystok: Zakład Historii Kultur Pogranicza Instytutu Socjologii Uniwersytetu w Białymstoku, 2000.

Connerton, Paul. *How Societies Remember.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989.

Cultural Exchange in Early Modern Europe, vol. I: *Religion and Cultural Exchange in Europe, 1400–1700.* Edited by Heinz Schilling and István György Tóth. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006.

Cultural Exchange in Early Modern Europe, vol. III: *Correspondence and Cultural Exchange in Europe, 1400–1700.* Edited by Francisco Bethencourt and Florike Egmond. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007.

Ćwikła, Leszek. *Polityka władz państwowych wobec Kościoła prawosławnego i ludności prawosławnej w Królestwie Polskim i Wielkim Księstwie Litewskim oraz Rzeczypospolitej Obojga Narodów w latach 1344–1795.* Lublin, Katolicki Uniwersytet Lubelski, 2006.

Czerniecka-Haberko, Anna. *Unie polsko-litewskie w historiografii polskiej.* Toruń: Wydawnictwo Adam Marszłek, 2013.

Davies, Norman. *Europe. A History.* Reprinted with corrections. London: Pimlico, 1997.

_____. *Europa. Istorija.* Translated from English by Leonas Tamas and Vytautas Petrukaitis. Vilnius: Vaga, 2002.

De Jong, Mayke, and Frans Theuws with Carine Van Rhijn, eds. *Topographies of Power in the Early Middle Ages.* Leiden: Brill, 2001.

Dembińska, A. *Polityczna walka o egzekucję dóbr królewskich w latach 1559–1564.* Warsaw: Nakład TN Warszawkiego, 1935.

Dorobisz, Janusz. "Kultura parlamentarna marszałków poselskich za pierwszych Wazów (1587–1648." In *Kultura parlamentarna epoki staropolskiej*, edited by Andrzej Stroynowski, 157–167. Warsaw: DiG, 2013.

Dubas-Urwanowicz, Ewa. "Możnowładztwo Koronne i Wielkiego Księstwa Litewskiego w latach 1492–1569. Próba porównania." In *Rzeczpospolita państwem wielu narodowości i wyznań. XVI-XVIII wiek*, edited by Tomasz Ciesielski and Anna Filipczak-Kocur, 179–195. Warsaw: DiG, 2008.

_____. "Metody i formy walki politycznej podczas obrad sejmików koronnych w dobie panowania Stefana Batorego." In *Kultura parlamentarna epoki staropolskiej*, edited by Andrzej Stroynowski, 117–128. Warsaw: DiG, 2013.

_____. *O nowy kształt Rzeczypospolitej. Kryzyz polityczny w państwie w latach 1576–1586.* Warsaw: DiG, 2013.

Duczmal, Małgorzata. *Jagiellonowie. Leksykon biograficzny.* Kraków: Wydawnictwo literackie, 1996.

Duchhardt, Heinz, and Gert Melville, eds. *Im Spannungsfeld von Recht und Ritual. Soziale Kommunikation in Mittelalter und Früher Neuzeit.* Cologne: Böhlau Verlag, 1997.

Dzięgielewski, Jan. "Radziwiłłowie posłami sejmów w czasach Władysława IV." In *Miscellanea historico-archivistica* 3: *Radziwiłłowie XVI-XVIII wieku: W kręgu polityki i kultury* (1989): 27–34.

_____. "Od staropolskiego 'miłośnika ojczyzny' do 'sarmackiego patrioty.'" In *Patriotyzm polaków. Studia z historii idei*, edited by Jacek Kloczkowski, 21–31. Kraków: Ośrodek Mysli Politycznej, 2006.

Ekes, Janusz. "*Piis Manibus*." In *Patriotyzm polaków. Studia z historii idei*, edited by Jacek Kloczkowski, 60–71. Kraków: Ośrodek Mysli Politycznej, 2006.

Erll, Astrid, and Ansgar Nünning in collaboration with Sara B. Young, eds. *Cultural Memory Studies. An International and Interdisciplinary Handbook*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2008.

Estreicher, Stanisław. "Kultura prawnicza w Polsce XVI wieku." In *Kultura staropolska*, edited by Roman Pollack and Teodor Ignacy, 40–118. Kraków: Polska Akademia Umiejętności, 1932.

Europa Triumphans. Court and Civic Festivals in Early Modern Europe, vol. I. General editors J. H. Mulryne, Helen Watanabe-O'Kelly, Margaret Shewring, associate general editors Elizabeth Goldring and Sarah Knight. Farnham: Ashgate, 2004.

Ferincz, I. "Litovskie kniazʹia i teoriia 'Moskva—tretii Rim.'" *Studia Russica* 18 (2000): 59–64.

Feuchter, J., and J. Helmrath. "Oratory and Representation: the Rhetorical Culture of Political Assemblies, 1300–1600," *Parliaments, Estates and Representation* 29, no. 1 (2009): 53–66.

Filipczak-Kocur, Anna. "Informacje o sejmach i sejmikach w korespondencji Sapiehów w Centralnym Państwowym Historycznym Archiwum w Kijowie." In *Studia z dziejów państwa i prawa polskiego*, vol. 9, part 1, 239–249. Lodz: Wydawnictwo uniwersytetu Łódzkiego, 2006.

Filiushkin, Aleksandr. *Izobretaia pervuiu voinu Rossii i Evropy. Baltiiskie voiny vtoroi poloviny XVI veka glazami sovremennikov i potomkov*. Saint Petersburg: Dmitrii Bulanin, 2013.

Floria, Boris. *Issledovaniia po istorii tserkvi. Drevnerusskoe i slavianskoe srednevekovʹe*. Moscow: TsNTs "Pravoslavnaia Entsiklopediia," 2007.

Formisano, Ronald P. "The Concept of Political Culture." *Journal of Interdisciplinary History* 31, no. 3 (Winter 2001): 393–426.

Friedrich, Karin. Introduction: "Citizenship and Identity in an Early Modern Commonwealth" to *Citizenship and Identity in a Multinacional Commonwealth. Poland-Lithuania in Context, 1550–1772*, edited by Karin Friedrich and Barbara M. Pendzich, 1–16. Leiden: Brill, 2009.

Frost, Robert I. "Lietuvos indėlis formuojant parlamentinę kultūrą Lietuvos-Lenkijos Respublikoje 1550–1668 m." In *Parlamentarizmo genezė Europoje ir Lietuvos atvejis*: tarptautinės konferencijos medžiaga, edited by A. Lukošaitis, M. Urbonaitė, R. Budnikaitė, 16–23. Vilnius: Parlamentinio bendravimo centras, 2008.

_____. "Lenkijos ir Lietuvos unija Vazų valdymo laikotarpiu (1587–1668)." In *LIETUVA—LENKIJA—ŠVEDIJA: Europos dinastinės jungtys ir istoriniai-kultūriniai ryšiai*, edited by Eugenijus Saviščevas and Marius Uzorka, 280–299. Vilnius: Nacionalinis muziejus Lietuvos Didžiosios Kunigaikštystės valdovų rūmai, 2014.

_____. *The Oxford History of Poland-Lithuania*, vol. 1: *The Making of the Polish-Lithianian Union, 1385–1569*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2015.

Gábor, Almási. *The Uses of Humanism: Johannes Sambucus (1531–1584), Andreas Dudith (1533–1589), and the Republic of Letters in East Central Europe*, part I: *Humanist Learning and Networks in East Central Europe.* Leiden: Brill, 2009.

Gałaj-Dempniak, Renata. "Postrzeganie sejmików przez szlachtę w epoce staropolskiej w świetle memuarów i utworów literackich." In *Kultura parlamentarna epoki staropolskiej*, edited by Andrzej Stroynowski, 61–74. Warsaw: DiG, 2013.

Gąsiorowski, Antoni. "Itineraria dwu ostatnich Jagiellonów." *Studia Historyczne* 16, no. 2 (1973): 249–275.

Gadamer, Hans-Georg. "Heimat und Sprache." In Hans-Georg Gadamer, *Gesammelte Werke*, vol. 8. Tübingen: C. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1993.

Gaddis, John Lewis. *The Landscape of History. How Historians Map the Past.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002.

Gierowski, Józef Andrzej, ed. *Dzieje kultury politycznej w Polsce*. Warsaw: Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe, 1977.

Giorgini, Giovani. "Cicero and Machiavelli. Two Visions of Statesmanship and Two Educational Projects Compared." *Etica & Politica / Ethics & Politics* 16, no. 2 (2014): 506–515. Accessed August 08, 2015. www2.units.it/etica/2014_2/GIORGINI.pdf.

Głębicka, Ewa J. "Pojęcia *populus* i *libertas* w politycznych traktatach Andrzeja Maksymiliana Fredry." In *Łacina jako język elit*, edited by Jerzy Axer, 109–120. Warsaw: Wydawnictwo DiG, 2004.

Goodin, Robert E., and Charles Tilly, eds. *The Oxford Handbook of Contextual Political Analysis*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006.

Górecki, Piotr, and Nancy van Deusen, eds. *Central and Eastern Europe in the Middle Ages. A Cultural History. Essays in Honour of Paul W. Knoll.* London: Tauris Academic Studies, 2009.

Górzyński, Sławomir, ed. *Unia w Horodle na tle stosunków polsko-litewskich. Od Krewa do Zaręczenia wzajemnego Obojga Narodów*. Warsaw: DiG, 2015.

Grala, Hieronim. "Źródła do dziejów stosunków polsko-moskiewskich w XVI w. (nowe znaleziska w archiwum Warszawskim Radziwiłłów)." In *Miscellanea historico-archivistica* 7 (1997): 135–153.

_____. "Od *bellum defensivum* do *bellum externum*. Ewolucja poglądów szlachty polsko-litewskiej na wojnę z państwem moskiewskim w drugiej połowie XVI w." In *Studia z dziejów stosunków Rzeczypospolitej z Panstwem Moskiewskim w XVI-XVII wieku*, edited by Mirosław Nagielski, Konrad Bobiatyński, and Przemysław Gawron, 13–29. Tarnowskie Góry: Wydawnictwo inforteditions, 2013.

Greengrass, Mark, and E. Arnold, eds. *Conquest and Coalescence. The Shaping of the State in Early Modern Europe*. London: Edward Arnold, 1991.

Grodziski, Stanisław. *Z dziejów staropolskiej kultury prawnej*: Kraków: Wydawnictwo Universitas, 2004.

Grześkowiak-Krwawicz, Anna. "Anti-monarchism in Polish Republicanism in the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries." In *Republicanism. A Shared European Heritage*, vol. 1: *Republicanism*

and Constitutionalism in Early Modern Europe, edited by Martin van Gelderen and Quentin Skinner, 43–59. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002.

Grześkowiak-Krwawicz, Anna, in collaboration with Jerzy Axer, eds. *Wartości polityczne Rzeczypospolitej Obojga Narodów. Struktury aksjologiczne i granice cywilizacyjne*. Warsaw: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Warszawskiego, 2017.

Gudavičius, Edvardas. *Mindaugas*. Vilnius: Žara, 1998.

―――――. *Lietuvos istorija nuo seniausių laikų iki 1569 metų*. Vilnius: Lietuvos rašytojų sąjungos leidykla, 1999.

―――――. "Zigmanto II 1529 metų šalies privilegija." In *Lietuvos Statutas ir Lietuvos Didžiosios Kunigaikštystės bajoriškoji visuomenė*, edited by Irena Valikonytė and Lirija Steponavičienė, 15–29. Vilnius: Vilniaus universiteto leidykla, 2015.

Gudavičius, Edvardas, and Irena Valikonytė. "Pirmojo Lietuvos Statuto vieta valstybės ir teisės istorijoje." In *Pirmasis Lietuvos Statutas*, edited by Edvardas Gudavičius, 8–35. Vilnius: Artlora, 2014.

Gudmantas, Kęstutis. "Lietuvių kilmės iš romėnų teorijos genezė ir ankstyvosios Lietuvos vardo etimologijos." In *Literatūros istorija ir jos kūrėjai*, vol. 17 of *Senoji Lietuvos literatūra*, edited by Pietro Umberto Dini and Sigitas Narbutas, 245–269. Vilnius: Lietuvių literatūros ir tautosakos institutas, 2004.

―――――. "Vėlyvųjų Lietuvos metraščių erdvė." *Darbai ir Dienos* 44: *Senoji Lietuva. Viduramžiai. Renesansas. Barokas* (2005): 105–124.

―――――. "Vėlyvųjų Lietuvos metraščių veikėjai ir jų prototipai: *romėnai*." In *Istorijos rašymo horizontai*, vol. 18 of *Senoji Lietuvos literatūra*, edited by Aušra Jurgutienė, 113–139. Vilnius: Lietuvių literatūros ir tautosakos institutas, 2005.

―――――. "Valdovo ir dinastijos įvaizdžiai vėlyvuosiuose Lietuvos metraščiuose." In *Lietuvos kultūros karališkasis dėmuo: įvaizdžiai, simboliai, reliktai*, edited by Sigita Maslauskaitė and Jolita Liškevičienė, 51–73. Vilnius: Vilniaus dailės akademijos leidykla, 2012.

Hammerstein, Notker, and Gerrit Walther, eds. *Späthumanismus. Studien über das Ende einer kulturhistorischen Epoche*. Göttingen: Wallstein Verlag, 2000.

Harding, Alan. *Medieval Law and the Foundation of the State*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001.

Helmrath, J. "Rhetorik und 'Akademisierung' auf deutschen Reichstagen im 15. und 16. Jahrhundert." In *Im Spannungsfeld von Recht und Ritual. Soziale Kommunikation in Mittelalter und Früher Neuzeit*, edited by Heinz Duchhardt and Gert Melville, 423–446. Köln: Böhlau Verlag, 1997.

―――――. "Der europäische Humanismus und die Funktionen der Rhetorik." In *Funktionen des Humanismus. Studien zur Nutzen des Neuen in der humanistischen Kultur*, edited by T. Maissen and G. Walther, 18–48. Göttingen: Wallstein Verlag, 2006.

Helmrath, J., and J. Feuchter. "Einleitung—Vormoderne Parlamentsoratorik." In *Politische Redekultur in der Vormoderne. Die Oratorik europäischer Parlamente in Spätmittelalter und Früher Neuzeit*, edited by Jörg Feuchter and Johannes Helmrath, 9–22. Frankfurt a.M.: Campus Verlag, 2008.

Hengerer, Mark. *Kaiserhof und Adel in der Mitte des 17 Jahrhunderts: Eine Kommunikationsgeschichte oder Macht in der Vormoderne*. Konstanz: UVK, 2004.

Herbers, Klaus, and Nikolas Jaspert, eds. *Grenzräume und Grenzüberschreitungen im Vergleich. Der Osten und der Westen des mittelalterlichen Lateineuropa*. Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 2007.

Hoffman, Carl A., and Rolf Kießling, eds. *Kommunikation und Region*. Konstanz: UVK, 2001.

Hołdys, Sybill A. "Charakterystyka sejmów za Władysława IV," *Śląski kwartalnik historyczny Sobótka* 48, no. 2–3: *Studia Historyczno-Prawne. Prace ofiarowane Kazimierzowi Orzechowskiemu w 70 rocznicę urodzin* (1993): 199–211.

Housley, Norman. *Religious Warfare in Europe, 1400–1536*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002.

Ihalainen, P., and K. Palonen. "Parliamentary Sources in the Comparative Study of Conceptual History: Methodological Aspects and Illustrations of a Research Proposal." *Parliaments, Estates and Representation* 29, no. 1 (2009): 17–34.

Iakovenko, Natalia. "Simvol 'bogokhranimogo grada' u pam´iatkakh kiivs´kogo kola (1620–1640-vi roki)." In Natalia Iakovenko, *Paralel´nyi svit. Doslidzhennia z istorii uiavlen´ ta idei v Ukraini XVI-XVII st.*, 296–330. Kyiv: Krytyka, 2002.

———. (as Iakovenko, Natal'ia). *Ocherk istorii Ukrainy v srednie veka i rannee novoe vremia.* Translated from Ukrainian by V. Ryzhkovskii. Moscow: Novoe Literaturnoe Obozrenie, 2005.

———. *Dzerkala identichnosti. Doslizhennia z istorii uiavlen´ ta idei v Ukraini XVI—pochatku XVIII stolittia*. Kyiv: Laurus, 2012.

Istorinės atminties diskurso prielaidos ir prieštaravimai. Vilnius: Vilniaus universiteto leidykla, 2014.

Iwanicka, Katarzyna, Maria Skowronek, and Kazimierz Stembrowicz, eds. *Parlament, prawo, ludzie. Studia ofiarowane profesorowi Juliuszowi Bardachowi w sześćdziesięciolecie pracy twórczej.* Warsaw: Wydawnictwo Sejmowe, 1996.

Jäger, Jens, and Martin Knauer, eds. *Bilder als historische Quellen? Dimension der Debatten um historische Bildforschung*. Munich: Wilhelm Fink Verlag, 2009.

Janicki, Marek. "Wolność i równość w języku prawno-politycznym oraz ideologii szlachty polskiej (od XIV do początku XVII wieku)." In *Łacina jako język elit*, edited by Jerzy Axer, 73–107. Warsaw: DiG, 2004.

Jankauskas, Vytas. *Kunigaikščiai Svirskiai XIV-XVI a.: Nuo gentinės aristokratijos iki LDK politinės tautos*. Kaunas: Spalvų kvartetas, 2016.

Jarczykowa, Mariola. *"Papirowe materie" Piotra Kochlewskiego. O działalnosci pisarskiej sekretarza Radziwiłłów birżańskich w pierwszej połowie XVII wieku*. Katowice: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Śląskiego, 2006.

Jarmolik, Włodzimierz. "Kariery polityczne dworzan litewskich Kazimierza Jagiellończyka." In *Europa Orientalis. Polska i jej wschodni sąsiedzi od śedniowiecza po współczesność. Studia i materiały ofiarowane Profesorowi Stanisławowi Alexandrawiczowi w 65 rocznicę urodzin*, edited by Zbigniew Karpus, Tomasz Kempa, and Dorota Michaluk, 93–101. Toruń: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Mikołaja Kopernika, 1996.

Jędruch, Jacek. *Constitution, Elections, and Legislature of Poland, 1493–1977*. Washington, D.C.: University Press of America, 1982.

Jovaišas, Albinas. *Martynas Mažvydas*: *pirmosios lietuviškos knygos parengėjas*. Kaunas: Šviesa, 1996.

⸻. "Trumpojo Lietuvos metraščių sąvado literatūrinės ypatybės ir paslaptys." In *Metraščiai ir kunigaikščių laiškai*, vol. 4 of *Senoji Lietuvos literatūra*, edited by Algis Samulionis, 222–261. Vilnius: Lietuvių literatūros ir tautosakos institutas, 1996.

⸻. "Augustino Rotundo Lietuvos valstybės vizija." In *Šešioliktojo amžiaus raštija*, vol. 5 of *Senoji Lietuvos literatūra*, edited by Sigitas Narbutas, 75–114. Vilnius: Pradai, 2000.

Jučas, Mečislovas. "Lietuvos Didžiosios Kunigaikštystės parlamentarizmas." In *Lietuvos seimas*, edited by Violeta Motulaitė, Statys Venckevičius, Edvardas Gudavičius et al., 79–112. Vilnius: Kultūra, 1996.

⸻. *Lietuvos ir Lenkijos unija (XIV a. vid.–XIX a. pr.)*. Vilnius: Aidai, 2000.

⸻. *Lietuvos metraščiai ir kronikos*. Vilnius: Aidai, 2002.

Jurkiewicz, Jan. "Rękopisy prac genealogicznych Michała Szęciłły i *obraz w nich początków Litwy*." In *Lietuvos Didžiosios Kunigaikštystės istorijos kraštovaizdis. Skiriama profesorės Jūratės Kiaupienės 65-mečiui*, edited by Ramunė Šmigelskytė-Stukienė, 115–146. Vilnius: Lietuvosistorijos instituto leidykla, 2012.

⸻. *Od Palemona do Giedymina. Wczesnowożytne wyobrażenia o początkach Litwy*, vol. 1: *W kręgu latopisów litewskich*. Poznań: Wydawnictwo Naukowe Uniwersytetu im. Adama Mickiewicza, 2013.

Kaczorowski, Włodzimierz. "Rola Krzystofa II Radziwiłła na sejmach konwokacyjnym i elekcyjnym w okresie bezkrólewia 1632 roku." In *Miscellanea historico-archivistica* 3: *Radziwiłłowie XVI-XVIII wieku: W kręgu polityki i kultury* (1989): 35–50.

⸻. "Litwini wśród elektorów Władysława IV." *Rocznik Białostocki* 17 (1991): 191–211.

Kahn, Victoria Ann. *Machiavellian Rhetoric. From the Counter-Reformation to Milton*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1994.

Kamiński, Andrzej S. *Historia Rzeczypospolitej Wielu Narodów, 1505–1795. Obywatele, ich państwa, społeczeństwo, kultura*. Lublin: Instytut Europy Środkowo Wschodniej, 2000.

Kantorowicz, Ernst H. *The King's Two Bodies. A Study in Medieval Political Theology*. First edition: Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1957. New supplemented edition with a new introduction by Conrad Leyser and a preface by William Chester Jordan. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2016.

Karabowicz, Anna. "Sejm czy król? Przyczynek do problemu prawodawstwa dla Wielkiego Księstwa Litewskiego za panowania Stefana Batorego (1576–1586)." In *Świat, Europa, mała ojczyzna. Studia ofiarowane Profesorowi Stanisławowi Grodziskiemu w 80-lecie urodzin*, edited by Marian Małecki, 189–207. Bielsko-Biała: Wyższa Szkoła Administracji, 2009.

⸻. "Współdziałanie króla i stanów w tworzeniu prawa za panowania Stefana Batorego." In *Społeczeństwo a władza. Ustrój, prawo, idee*, edited by Jacek Przygodzki and Marian J. Ptak, 239–251. Wrocław: Kolonia Limited, 2010.

Kempa, Tomasz. *Konstantyn Wasyl Ostrogski (ok. 1524/1525–1608) wojewoda Kijowski i marszałek ziemi Wołyńskiej*. Toruń: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Mikołaja Kopernika, 1997.

Kempa, Tomasz, and Krzysztof Mikulski, eds. *Unia lubelska z 1569 roku. Z tradycji unifikacyjnych I Rzeczypospolitej*. Toruń: Wydawnictwo Adam Marszałek, 2011.

Kempa, Tadeusz. *Mikołaj Krzysztof Radziwiłł Sierotka (1549–1616), wojewoda wileński*. Warsaw: Semper, 2000.

_____. "Magnateria ruska wobec unii lubelskiej (1569)." *Białoruskie Zeszyty Historyczne* 16 (2001): 5–25.

_____. "The issue regarding 'The Reform of the Union' of Lublin in Lithuanian policy in the period of three *interregna* following the death of king Sigismund Augustus (1572–1588)." *Zapiski Historyczne* 79, no. 4 (2014): 53–88.

Kiaupa, Z., J. Kiaupienė, and A. Kuncevičius. *The History of Lithuania before 1795*. English translation edited by Milda Danytė and Nijolė Borges. Vilnius: Arlila Press, 2000.

Kiaupa, Zigmantas. "Alberto Kojalavičiaus ir jo brolių kilmė bei šeima." In *Albertas Vijūkas-Kojalavičius, Lietuvos istorijos įvairenybės*, vol. 2, 356–367. Vilnius: Lietuvių literatūros ir tautosakos institutas, 2004.

_____. "Konstytucje Wielkiego Księstwa Litewskiego na sejmach Rzeczypospolitej Obojga Narodów jako wyraz życia politycznego." In *Kultura parlamentarna epoki staropolskiej*, edited by Andrzej Stroynowski, 27–32. Warsaw: DiG, 2013.

Kiaupienė, Jūratė. "Litewskie cechy kultury politycznej szlachty Wielkiego Księstwa Litewskiego w XVI wieku." In *Kultura Litwy i Polski w dziejach. Tożsamość i współistnienie*, edited by Jerzy Wyrozumski, 67–78. Kraków: Międzynarodowy Centrum Kultury, 2000.

_____. *"Mes, Lietuva." Lietuvos Didžiosios Kunigaikštystės bajorija XVI a. (viešasis ir privatus gyvenimas)*. Vilnius: Kronta, 2003.

_____. "Naród polityczny Wielkiego Księstwa Litewskiego w XVI wieku: pojęcie ojczyzny." In *Łacina jako język elit*, edited by Jerzy Axer, 295–318. Warsaw: DiG, 2004.

_____. "Some Considerations on the Sources of Unity of the Lithuanian Political Nation in the Sixteenth Century." In *Podział władzy i parlamentaryzm w przeszłości i współcześnie. Prawo, doktryna, praktyka. 500, rocznica konstytucji Nihil novi z 1505 r. 56. Konferencja Międzynarodowej Komisji Historii Instytucji Reprezentatywnych i Parlamentarnych w Krakowie i Radomiu (September 5–8, 2005). Prace przedstawione Międzynarodowej Komisji Historii Instytucji Reprezentatywnych i Parlamentarnych / Separation of Powers and Parliamentarism. The Past and the Present Law, Doctrine, Practice. Five Hundred Years Anniversary of the Nihil novi Statute of 1505–56th Conference of International Commision for the History of Representative and Parliamentary Institutions in Cracow and Radom (5–8 September 2005). Studies presented to the International Commision for the History of Representative and Parliamentary Institutions*, vol. 84, edited by Wacław Uruszczak, Kazimierz Baran, and Anna Karabowicz, 326–333. Warsaw: Sejm Publishing Office, 2007.

_____. [as Iurate Kiaupene]. "Osobennosti politicheskoi kul´tury Velikogo Kniazhestva Litovskogo v XVI v." In *Balty i Velikoe kniazhestvo Litovskoe. Istoriko–lingvisticheskii vzgliad. Pamiati Ėgidiusa Banenisa*, 54–66. Moscow: Novoe izdatel´stvo, 2007.

_____. "Rola klienteli w procesie jednoczenia narodu politycznego Wielkiego Księstwa Litewskiego w XVI wieku." In *Rzeczpospolita państwem wielu narodowości i wyznań. XVI-XVIII wiek*, edited by Tomasz Ciesielski and Anny Filipczak-Kocur, 167–178. Warsaw: DiG, 2008.

_____. "Naród polityczny Wielkiego Księstwa Litewskiego a przestrzeń jagiellońska." In *Europa Orientalis. Studia z dziejów Europy Wschodniej i państw bałtyckich* 1 (2009): 187–196.

_____. "Wojny Wielkiego Księstwa Litewskiego z Moskwą jako czynnik kulturotwórczy w drugiej połowie XVI wieku—pierwszej połowie XVII wieku (zarys problematyki)." In *Środowiska kulturotwórcze i kontakty kulturalne Wielkiego Księstwa Litewskiego od XV do XIX wieku*, edited by Urszula Augustyniak, 167–172. Warsaw: Neriton, 2009.

_____. "*My, Litwa*—formula patriotyzmu narodu politycznego Wielkiego Księstwa Litewskiego w XVI wieku." In *Formuły patriotyzmu w Europie Wschodniej i Środkowej od nowożytności do wsółczesności*, edited by Andrzej Nowak and Andrzej A. Zięba, 17–26. Kraków: Uniwersytet Jagielloński, 2009.

_____. "How War Changed the Landscape of Political Culture in Sixteenth Century East-Central Europe." In *Baltiiskii vopros v kontse XV–XVI v., Sbornik nauchnykh statei*, edited by A. I. Filiushkin, 397–405. Moscow: Kvadriga, 2010.

_____. "Formation and Transformations of Dynastic Ties between the Grand Duchy of Lithuania and the Kingdom of Poland from 1386–1501." *Lituanus. The Lithuanian Ouarterly* 56, no. 3 (2010): 5-24.

_____. "Lietuvos Didžiosios Kunigaikštystės teritorinio vientisumo suardymo 1569 m. problema Liublino unijos istoriografijos kontekste: tradicijų ir naujų interpretacijų erdvė." / "Problem rozbicia jedności terytorialnej Wielkiego Księstwa Litewskiego w 1569 roku w kontekście historiografii poświęconej unii lubelskiej: tradycje i nowe interpretacje." In *Liublino unija: idėja ir jos tęstinumas / Unia lubelska: idea i jej kontynuacja*, edited by Liudas Glemža and Ramunė Šmigelskytė-Stukienė, 102–113 and 114–125. Vilnius: Nacionalinis muziejus Lietuvos Didžiosios Kunigaikštystės valdovų rūmai, 2011.

_____. "Lietuvos Didžiosios Kunigaikštystės ankstyvųjų Naujųjų laikų seimo retorikos pažinimo šaltiniai." In *Ministri historiae. Pagalbiniai istorijos mokslai Lietuvos Didžiosios Kunigaikštystės tyrimuose. Mokslinių straipsnių rinkinys, skirtas Edmundo Antano Rimšos 65-mečio sukakčiai*, edited by Zigmantas Kiaupa and Jolita Sarcevičienė, 283–294. Vilnius: Lietuvos istorijos instituto leidykla, 2013.

_____. "500-letnia rocznica unii horodelskiej 1413 roku. Między kulturą polityczną a pamięcią historyczną." *Prace Historyczne* 141, no. 2: *Unia horodelska* (2014): 395–407.

_____. "Petro Skargos 'Seimo pamokslai' ir Abiejų Tautų Respublikos bajorų politinės kultūros kraštovaizdis." In Petras Skarga, *Seimo pamokslai. Kvietimas atgailauti Lenkijos Karalystės ir Lietuvos Didžiosios Kunigaikštystės piliečiams*, edited by Viktorija Vaitkevičiūtė, 23–40. Vilnius: Lietuvių literatūros ir tautossakos institutas, 2014.

_____. "1588 metų Lietuvos Statutas Abiejų Tautų Respublikos politinės kultūros erdvėje (iki XVII a. pradžios)." In *Lietuvos Statutas ir Lietuvos Didžiosios Kunigaikštystės bajoriškoji visuomenė*, edited by Irena Valikonytė and Lirija Steponavičienė, 47–61. Vilnius: Vilniaus universiteto leidykla, 2015.

Kieniewicz, Leszek. *Senat za Stefana Batorego*. Warsaw: Wydawnictwo Sejmowe, 2000.

Kilias, Jarosław. *Wspólnota abstrakcyjna. Zarys socjologii narodu.* Warsaw: Wydawnictwo Instytutu Filozofii i Socjologii PAN, 2004.

Kloczkowski, Jacek, ed. *Patriotyzm polaków. Studia z historii idei*. Kraków: Ośrodek Mysli Politycznej, 2006.

Koehler, Krzysztof. *Stanisław Orzechowski i dylematy humanizmu renesansowego*. Kraków: Arcana, 2004.

———. "Patriotyzm w okresie kontrreformacji." In *Patriotyzm polaków. Studia z historii idei*, edited by Jacek Kloczkowski, 32–59. Kraków: Ośrodek Myśli Politycznej, 2006.

Kolankowski, L. *Polska Jagiellonów. Dzieje polityczne*. Lviv: Gubrynowicz i Syn, 1936.

Kołodziej, Robert, and Michał Zwierzykowski. *Bibliografia parlamentaryzmu Rzeczypospolitej szlacheckiej*. Poznań: Wydawnictwo Poznańskie, 2012.

Konieczna, Diana. *Ustrój i funkcionowanie sejmiku brzeskolitewskiego w latach 1565–1763*. Warsaw: DiG, 2013.

Konopczyński, Władysław. *Chronologia sejmów polskich 1493–1793*. Kraków: Polska Akademia Umiejętności, 1948.

Kopperschmidt, J. "Oratorik—ein erfolgversprechendes Forschungsprojekt?" In *Politische Redekultur in der Vormoderne. Die Oratorik europäischer Parlamente in Spätmittelalter und Früher Neuzeit*, edited by Jörg Feuchter and Johannes Helmrath, 23–44. Frankfurt a.M.: Campus Verlag, 2008.

Kosman, Marceli. "Political Culture in Lithuania in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries," In *Political Culture in Central Europe (10th–20th Century)*, part 1: *Middle Ages and Early Modern Era*. Edited by Halina Manikowska and Jaroslav Pánek in cooperation with Martin Holý, 249–265. Prague: Historický ústav Akademie věd, 2005.

Kosman, Marceli, ed. *Kultura polityczna w Polsce*, vol. 5: *Elity dawne i nowe*. Poznań: Wydawnictwo Naukowe INPiD UAM, 2005.

———. *Kultura polityczna w Polsce*, vol. 6, no. 1: *Litwa w polskiej tradycji i kulturze politycznej*. Poznań: Wydawnictwo Naukowe INPiD UAM, 2006.

Korczak, Lidia. "Początki litewskiego parlamentaryzmu na tłe porównawczym." In *Parlamentskiia struktury ulady u sisteme dziazhaunaga kiravaniia Vialikaga kniastva Litouskaga i Rėchy Paspalitai u XV-XVIII stagoddziakh*, 27–40. Minsk: Belaruski instytut pravaznawstva, 2008.

———. *Monarcha i poddani. System władzy w Wielkim Księstwie Litewskim w okresie wczesno-jagiellońskim*. Kraków: Towarzystwo Wydawnicze "Historia Iagellonica," 2008.

Korczak, Lidia, ed. "Actum baronum et nobilium Regni Poloniae." In *1413 metų Horodlės aktai (Dokumentai ir tyrinėjimai) / Akty horodelskie z 1413 roku (Dokumenty i studia)*, edited by Jūratė Kiaupienė, Lidia Korczak, Piotr Rabiej, Edmundas Rimša, and Jan Wroniszewski, 19–21. Vilnius: Lietuvos istorijos instituto leidykla, 2013.

———. "Actum nobilium Magni Ducatus Lithuaniae." In *1413 metų Horodlės aktai (Dokumentai ir tyrinėjimai) / Akty horodelskie z 1413 roku (Dokumenty i studia)*, edited by Jūratė Kiaupienė, Lidia Korczak, Piotr Rabiej, Edmundas Rimša, and Jan Wroniszewski, 29–31. Vilnius: Lietuvos istorijos instituto leidykla, 2013.

Kotljarchuk, Andrej. *In the Shadows of Poland and Russia. The Grand Duchy of Lithuania and Sweden in the European Crisis of the Mid-17th Century*. Huddinge: Södertörns högskola, 2006.

Kowalski, Mariusz. *Księstwa Rzeczpospolitej. Państwo magnackie jako region polityczny. Prace geograficzne* 238 (2013).

Koźmiński, Maciej, ed. *Cywilizacja europejska. Eseje i szkice z dziejów cywilizacji i dyplomacji*. Warsaw: Instytut Historii PAN, 2010.

Kriegseisen, Wojcech. *Sejmiki Rzeczypospolitej szlacheckiej w XVII i XVIII wieku*. Warsaw: Wydawnictwo Sejmowe, 1991.

———. *Stosunki wyznaniowe w relacjach państwo-kościół między reformacją a oświeceniem (Rzesza Niemiecka—Niderlandy Północne—Rzeczpospolita polsko-litewska)*. Warsaw: Semper, 2010.

Kuolys, Darius. *Asmuo, tauta, valstybė Lietuvos Didžiosios Kunigaikštystės istorinėje literatūroje. Renesansas, Barokas*. Vilnius: Mokslo ir enciklopedijų leidykla, 1992.

———. "Laisvės sampratos XVI a. Lietuvos Didžiosios Kunigaikštystės raštijoje." In *Seminarai*, edited by Alvydas Jokubaitis and Antanas Kulakauskas, 31–38. Vilnius: Vyturys, 1998.

———. "Visuomenės raidos projekcijos XVI amžiaus Lietuvos Didžiosios Kunigaikštystės raštijoje." In *Šešioliktojo amžiaus raštija*, vol. 5 of *Senoji Lietuvos literatūra*, edited by Sigitas Narbutas, 9–22. Vilnius: Pradai, 2000.

———. "Alberto Vijūko-Kojalavičiaus istorinis pasakojimas: Respublikos kūrimas." In: Albertas Vijūkas-Kojalavičius, *Lietuvos istorijos įvairenybės*, part 2, 368–412. Vilnius: Lietuvių literatūros ir tautosakos institutas, 2004.

———. *Res Lituana—Kunigaikštystės bendrija*, vol. 1: *Respublikos steigimas*. Vilnius: Lietuvių literatūros ir tautosakos institutas, 2009.

Kümin, Beat, ed. *Political Space in Pre-industrial Europe*. With a preface by James C. Scott. Farnham: Ashgate, 2009.

Lappo, Ivan. *Velikoe Kniazhestvo Litovskoe za vremia ot zakliucheniia Liublinskoi unii do smerti Stefana Batoriia*. Saint Petersburg, 1901.

———. *Velikoe Kniazhestvo Litovskoe vo vtoroi polovine XVI stoletiia. Litovsko–russkii povet i ego seimiki*. Iur´ev, 1911.

———. *1588 metų Lietuvos Statutas*, vol. 1, *Tyrinėjimas*. Kaunas: Akc "Spindulio" B-ves spaustuvė, 1934.

———. *1588 metų Lietuvos Statutas*, vol. 2, *Tekstas*. Kaunas: Akc "Spindulio" B-ves spaustuvė, 1938.

Lazutka, Stanislovas. *Lietuvos Statutai, jų kūrėjai ir epocha*. Kaunas: Spindulys, 1994.

Lichterman, Paul, and Daniel Cefai. "The Idea of Political Culure." In *The Oxford Handbook of Contextual Political Analysis*, edited by Robert E. Goodin and Charles Tilly, 392–414. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006.

Liedke, Marzena. "Świadomość narodowa i udział szlachty oraz możnych ruskich Wielkiego Księstwa Litewskiego w kształtowaniu się narodu szlacheckiego Rzeczypospolitej w drugiej połowie XVI wieku." In *Europa Orientalis. Polska i jej wschodni sąsiedzi od średniowiecza po*

współczesność. Studia i materiały ofiarowane Profesorowi Stanisławowi Alexandrawiczowi w 65 rocznicę urodzin, edited by Zbigniew Karpus, Tomasz Kempa and Dorota Michaluk, 135–144. Toruń: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Mikołaja Kopernika, 1996.

Lietuvos istorija, vol. 3: *XIII a.–1385. Valstybės iškilimas tarp Rytų ir Vakarų*. Edited by D. Baronas, A. Dubonis, and R. Petrauskas. Vilnius: Baltos lankos, 2011.

Lietuvos istorija, vol. 4: *Nauji horizontai: dinastija, visuomenė, valstybė. Lietuvos Didžioji Kunigaikštystė 1386 -1529 m*. Eited by Jūratė Kiaupienė and Rimvydas Petrauskas. Vilnius: Baltos lankos, 2009.

Lietuvos istorija, vol. 5: *Veržli Naujųjų laikų pradžia. Lietuvos Didžioji Kunigaikštystė 1529–1588 m*. Edited by Jūratė Kiaupienė and Ingė Lukšaitė. Vilnius: Baltos lankos, 2013.

Lietuvos istorija, vol. 6: *Lietuvos Didžioji Kunigaikštystė XVI a. pabaigoje—XVIII a. pradžioje (1588–1733)*. Edited by Gintautas Sliesoriūnas. Vilnius: Lietuvos istorijos instituto leidykla, 2015.

Lichy, Kolja. "How to do politics with words: oratory, ceremonial and procedure in the Sejm and the Reichstag (c. 1500–1570)." In *Parliaments, Estates and Representation*, vol. 29, issue 1 (2009): 67–84.

_____. "Reden als Aushandeln: Rhetorik und Zeremoniell auf dem polnisch-litauischen Sejm zu Beginn der Wasa-Zeit." In *Politische Redekultur in der Vormoderne*: *die Oratorik europäischer Parlamente in Spätmittelalter und Früher Neuzeit*, edited by Jörg Feuchter and Johannes Helmrath, 149–172. Frankfurt am Main: Campus Verlag, 2008.

Literatūra ir Lietuvos modernėjimo procesai XV-XVIII a., vol. 33 of *Senoji Lietuvos literatūra*. Edited by Mintautas Čiurinskas. Vilnius: Mokslo ir enciklopedijų leidykla, 2012.

Liubavskii, Matvei. *Litovsko–Russkii seim. Opyt po istorii uchrezhdeniia v sviazi s vnutrennim stroeniem i vneshneiu zhizn´iu gosudarstva*. Moscow: Universitetskaia Tipografiia, 1900.

Lukšaitė, Ingė. "Andrius Volanas XVI-XVII a. Lietuvos visuomenės pertvarkos kryžkelėse." In Andrius Volanas, *Rinktiniai raštai*, 27–48. Vilnius: Mokslo ir enciklopedijų leidykla, 1996.

_____. "Die reformatorischen Kirchen Litauens bis 1795 Litauens." In *Die reformatorischen Kirchen Litauens*: *Ein historischer Abriß*, edited by Arthur Hermann and Wilhelm Kahle, 19–136. Erlangen: Martin–Luter–Verlag, 1998.

_____. *Reformacija Lietuvos Didžiojoje Kunigaikštystėje ir Mažojoje Lietuvoje. XVI a. trečias dešimtmetis – XVII a. pirmas dešimtmetis*. Vilnius: Baltos lankos, 1999.

_____. "Liublino unija ir identitetų kaitos Lietuvos Didžiojoje Kunigaikštystėje XVI a. antroje pusėje / Unia lubelska a zmiany tożsamości w Wielkim Księstwie Litewskim w drugiej połowie XVI wieku." In *Liublino unija: idėja ir jos tęstinumas / Unia lubelska: idea i jej kontynuacja*, edited by Liudas Glemža and Ramunė Šmigelskytė-Stukienė, 216–232 and 233–252. Vilnius: Nacionalinis muziejus Lietuvos Didžiosios Kunigaikštystės valdovų rūmai, 2011.

_____. *Die Reformation in Grossfürsten Litauen und in Preussisch-Litauen (1520er Jahre bis zum Beginn des 17. Jahrhunderts)*. Traslated from Lithuanian by Lilija Künstling and Gottfried Schneider. Leipzig: Leipziger Universitätsverlag GmbH, 2017.

Lulewicz, Henryk. *Elita polityczno-społeczna Wielkiego Księstwa Litewskiego w połowie XVII wieku*. PhD dissertation, Warsaw University, 1984.

———. *Gniewów o unię ciąg dalszy. Stosunki polsko-litewskie w latach 1569–1588*. Warsaw: Neriton, 2002.

———. "Najstarsza znana instrukcja sejmikowa z Wielkiego Księstwa Litewskiego. Sejmik wilenski przed sejmem warszawskim 1570 roku." In *Studia Historyczno-Prawne. Prace dedykowane Profesorowi Janowi Seredyce w siedemdziesiątą piątą rocznicę urodzin i czterdziestopięciolecie pracy naukowej*, edited by Janusz Dorobisz, Włodzimierz Kaczorowski, 171–180. Opole: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Opolskiego, 2004.

Łatyszonek, Oleg. *Od Rusinów białych do Białorusinów. U źródeł białoruskiej idei narodowej*. Bialystok: Wydawnictwo uniwersytetu w Białymstoku, 2006.

Łopatecki, Karol. *Organizacja, prawo i dyscyplina w Polskim i Litewskim pospolitym ruszeniu (do połowy XVII wieku)*. Białystok: Instytut Badań nad Dziedzictwem Kulturowym Europy, 2013.

Mączak, Antoni, and Elisabeth Müller–Luckner, eds. *Klientelsystem im Europa der Frühen Neuzeit*. Munich: R.Oldenburg, 1988.

Machovenko, Jevgenij. *Nelietuviškų žemių teisinė padėtis Lietuvos Didžiojoje Kunigaikštystėje (XIV–XVIII a.)*. Vilnius: Vilniaus universiteto leidykla, 1999.

———. "Lietuvos viešosios teisės iki XVIII a. pabaigos istorijos tyrimų būklė ir perspektyvos." *Teisė* 79 (2011): 31–32.

Makauskas, Bronius, and Vytautas J. Černius. *History of Lithuania. From Medieval Kingdom to Modern Democracy*. Lithuanian American Community, 2018.

Makiłła, Dariusz. "Idea jedności a koncepcja rozdziału władzy w teorii i praktyce ustrojowej Rzeczypospolitej na przełomie XVI–XXVII w." In *W kręgu nowożytnej i najnowszej historii ustroju Polski. Księga dedykowana Profesorowi Marianowi Kallasowi*, edited by Sławomir Godek, Dariusz Makiłła, and Magdalena Wilczek-Karczewska, 1-20. Warsaw: InterLeones Halina Dyczkowska, 2010.

Maksimeiko, Nikolai. *Seimy Litovsko-russkago gosudarstva do Liublinskoi unii 1569 g.* Khar´kov: Tipografiia A. Darre, 1902.

Markiewicz, Mariusz, and Ryszard Skowron, eds. *Theatrum ceremoniale na dworze książąt i królów polskich*. Kraków: Zamek Królewski na Wawelu, 1999.

Markiewicz, Mariusz. "'Jedyna i nieporównywalna?'—normalne państwo europejskie czy może państwo pogranicza?" In *Między Zachodem a Wschodem. Studia z dziejów Rzeczypospolitej w epoce Nowożytnej*, edited by Jacek Staszewski, Krzysztof Mikulski, and Jarosław Dumanowski. Toruń: Wydawnictwo Adam Marszalek, 2002.

Mazur, Karol. "Nieznana petycja szlachty wołyńskiej do króla w dobie sejmu lubelskiego 1569 r." *Sotsium* 2 (2003): 41–56.

———. "Szlachta wołyńska wobec unii jagiellońskiej w dobie sejmu lubelskiego 1569 r." *Przegląd Historyczny* 95, no. 1 (2004): 37–52.

———. *W stronę integracji z Koroną. Sejmiki Wołynia i Ukrainy w latach 1569–1648*. Warsaw: Neriton, 2006.

Mertens, D. "Die Rede als institutionalisierte Kommunikation im Zeitalter des Humanismus." In *Im Spannungsfeld von Recht und Ritual. Soziale Kommunikation in Mittelalter und Früher Neuzeit*, edited by Heinz Duchhardt and Gert Melville, 401–421. Köln: Böhlau Verlag, 1997.

Michaluk, Dorota. "Palenkės inkorporavimas į Lenkijos Karalystę 1569 metais / Incorporacja Podlasia do Korony Królestwa Polskiego w 1569 roku." In *Liublino unija: idėja ir jos tęstinumas / Unia lubelska: idea i jej kontynuacja*, edited by Liudas Glemža and Ramunė Šmigelskytė-Stukienė, 128–141 and 142–156. Vilnius: Nacionalinis muziejus Lietuvos Didžiosios Kunigaikštystės valdovų rūmai, 2011.

Mironowicz, Antoni. *Kościół prawosławny w państwie Piastów i Jagiellonów*. Białystok: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu w Białymstoku, 2003.

_____. "Orthodox Church in the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth in the 16th–18th Century." *Białostockie Teki Historyczne* 14 (2016): 41–61.

Moniuszko, Adam. "Projekty korektury ziemskiego prawa koronnego Jana Januszowskiego—polityczne uwarunkowania niepowodzenia / Jan Januszowski's draft amendments of the crown's land law: political circumstances of the failure / Entwürfe der Korrektur des königlichen Landrechts von Jan Januszowski—politische Bedingtheiten des Misserfolgs." *Studia z dziejów państwa i prawa polskiego* 16 (2013): 59–71.

_____. "III Statut a próby kodyfikacji prawa koronnego za panowania Zygmunta III." In *Lietuvos Statutas ir Lietuvos Didžiosios Kunigaikštystės bajoriškoji visuomenė*, edited by Irena Valikonytė and Lirija Steponavičienė, 63–74. Vilnius: Vilniaus universiteto leidykla, 2015.

Muir, Edward. *Ritual in Early Modern Europe*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005.

Narbutas, Sigitas. *Tradicija ir originalumas Jono Radvano "Radviliadoje."* Vilnius: Lietuvių literatūros ir tautosakos institutas, 1998.

_____. "Lietuvių kilmės iš romėnų legenda kultūrinės integracijos šviesoje." In *Literatūros istorija ir jos kūrėjai*, vol. 17 of *Senoji Lietuvos literatūra*, edited by Pietro Umberto Dini and Sigitas Narbutas, 286–315. Vilnius: Lietuvių literatūros ir tautosakos institutas, 2004.

_____. "*Latinitas* Lietuvos Didžiojoje Kunigaikštystėje: chronologija, ypatybės ir recepcijos pavidalai." In *Ministri historiae. Pagalbiniai istorijos mokslai Lietuvos Didžiosios Kunigaikštystės tyrimuose. Mokslinių straipsnių rinkinys, skirtas Edmundo Antano Rimšos 65-mečio sukakčiai*, edited by Zigmantas Kiaupa and Jolita Sarcevičienė, 153–169. Vilnius: Lietuvos istorijos instituto leidykla, 2013.

_____. "Latinitas in the Grand Duchy of Lithuania. Chronology, Specifics and Forms of Reception." In *Latinitas in the Polish Crown and the Grand Duchy of Lithuania. Its Impact on the Development of Identities*, edited by Giovanna Siedina, 145–161. Florence: Firenze University Press, 2014.

Narbutienė, Daiva. *Lietuvos Didžiosios Kunigaikštijos lotyniškoji knyga XV-XVII a.* Vilnius: Lietuvių literatūros ir tautosakos institutas, 2004.

Nederman, C. J. Review of *The Prince and the Law, 1200–1600. Sovereignty and Rights in the Western Legal Tradition*, by K. Pennington. *Parergon* 12, no. 2 (January 1995): 223–225.

Niedźwiedź, Jakub. *Nieśmiertelne teatra sławy. Teoria i praktika twórczości panegerycznej na Litwie w XVII-XVIII w.* Kraków: Księgarnia Akademicka, 2003.

_____. *Kultura literacka Wilna (1323–1655). Retoryczna organizacja miasta.* Kraków: Universitas, 2012.

Niendorf, Matias. *Das Großfürstentum Litauen. Studien zur Nationsbildung in der Frühen Neuzeit (1569–1795).* Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag, 2006.

Nikodem, Jarosław. "Zbigniew Oleśnicki wobec unii polsko-litewskiej do śmierci Jagiełły." *Nasza przeszłość. Studia z dziejów Kościoła i kultury katolickiej w Polsce* 91 (1999): 142–149.

Nikžentaitis, Alvydas. "Lietuvos Didžiosios Kunigaikštystės politinės tautos specifika ir santykis su moderniąja tauta." In *Praeities pėdsakais. Skiriama Profesoriaus daktaro Zigmanto Kiaupos 65-mečiui.* Edited by Edmundas Rimša, Egidijus Aleksandravičius, and Artūras Dubonis, 135–154. Vilnius: LII leidykla, 2007.

Norkus, Zenonas. "Maxo Weberio feodalizmo samprata ir Lietuvos istorija." *Lietuvos istorijos studijos* 4 (1997): 44–54.

_____. "Senoji kultūros istorija ir naujoji kultūrinė istorija." *Lietuvos istorijos studijos* 15 (2005): 17–37.

_____. *Nepasiskelbusioji imperija. Lietuvos Didžioji Kunigaikštija lyginamosios istorinės imperijų sociologijos požiūriu.* Vilnus: Aidai, 2009.

_____. "Imperial Past of Ancient Lithuanian in the Historical memory of the Modern Independent Lithuania." *Prace Historyczne* 141, no. 2: *Unia horodelska* (2014): 409–433.

_____. "The Grand Duchy of Lithuania in the Retrospective of Comparative Historical Sociology of Empires." *World Political Science Review* 3, no. 4 (2007): 1–41.

Nowak, Andrzej. "Horodło z perspektywy XX–XXI wieku: pamięć modernizacji, pamięć republiki, pamięć imperium." *Prace Historyczne* 141, no. 2: *Unia horodelska* (2014): 435–458.

Nowicka-Jeżowa, Alina, ed. *Humanitas—projekty antropologii humanistycznej*, vol. 1: *Paradygmaty, tradycje, profile historyczne.* Warsaw: Neriton, 2010.

Opaliński, Edward. *Kultura polityczna szlachty polskiej w latach 1587–1652. System parlamentarny a społeczeństwo obywatelskie.* Warsaw: Wydawnictwo Sejmowe, 1995.

_____. *Sejm srebrnego wieku 1587–1652. Między głosowaniem większościowym a liberum veto.* Warsaw: Wydawnictwo sejmowe, 2001.

_____. "Civic Humanism and Republican Citizenship in the Polish Renaissance." In *Republicanism. A Shared European Heritage*, vol 1: *Republicanism and Constitutionalism in Early Modern Europe*, edited by Martin van Gelderen and Quentin Skinner, 147–166. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002.

_____. "Civic Culture of the Polish Nobility in the Sixteenth and Early Seventeenth Century." In *Political Culture in Central Europe (10th–20th Century)*, part 1: *Middle Ages and Early Modern Era.* Edited by Halina Manikowska and Jaroslav Pánek in cooperation with Martin Holý, 233–248. Prague: Historický ústav Akademie věd, 2005.

_____. "Die politische Rolle der Adelsfreiheit in Polen-Litauen im 16. und 17. Jahrhundert." In *Kollektive Freiheitsvorstellungen im frühneuzeitlichen Europa (1400–1850)*, edited by Georg

Schmidt, Martin van Gelderen, and Christopher Snigula, 223–238. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang Europäischer Verlag der Wissenschaften, 2006.

Oparina, Tatiana. "Moskva kak novyi Kiev, ili gde zhe proizoshlo kreshchenie Rusi: vzgliad iz pervoi poloviny XVII veka." In *Istoria i pamiat´: istoricheskaia kul´tura Evropy do nachala Novogo vremeni*, edited by L. P. Repina, 635–663. Moscow, 2006.

Padalinski, Uladzimir. "Szlachta Wielkiego Księstwa Litewskiego w misjach dyplomatycznych Rzeczypospolitej (ostatnie trzydiestolecie XVI wieku)." In *Polska wobec wielkich konfliktów w Europie nowożytniej. Z dziejów dyplomacji i stosunków międzynarodowych w XV–XVIII wieku*, edited by Ryszard Skowron, 245–262. Kraków: Societas Vistulana, 2009.

———. "The representation of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania in the final stage of the seym of Lublin (June-August 1569)." *Zapiski Historyczne* 79, no. 4 (2014): 27–52.

———. "Stanowisko szlachty Wielkiego Księstwa Litewskiego wobec instytucji sejmu walnego w końcu XVI wieku." In *Kultura parlamentarna epoki staropolskiej*, edited by Andrzej Stroynowski, 143–156. Warsaw: DiG, 2013.

Pagden, Anthony, ed. *The Languages of Political Theory in Early-Modern Europe*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987.

Patiejūnienė, E. "Trys Motiejaus Strijkovskio Kronikos vertimo ištraukos." In *Literatūra ir Lietuvos modernėjimo procesai XV-XVIII a.*, vol. 33 of *Senoji Lietuvos literatūra*, edited by Mintautas Čiurinskas, 244. Vilnius: Mokslo ir enciklopedijų leidykla, 2012.

Paravicini, Verner, in collaboration with Jan Hirschbiegel and Jörg Wettlaufer, eds. *Höfe and Rezidenz im spätmittelalterlichen Reich: Bilder und Begriffe*, vol. 1-–2. Stuttgart: Jan Thorbecke Verlag, 2005.

"Parlamentsrede." In *Historische Wörterbuch der Rhetorik*, edited by Gert Ueding, vol. 6, 582–636. Tübingen: Max Niemeyer Verlag, 2003.

Parlamentskiia struktury ulady u sisteme dziaraunaga kirovaniia Vialikaga kniaztva Litouskaga i Rēchy Paspalitaia u XV–XVIII stagoddziach. Minsk, 2008.

Pennington, K. *The Prince and the Law, 1200–1600. Sovereignty and Rights in the Western Legal Tradition*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1993.

Petras Skarga ir Lietuvos Didžiosios Kunigaikštystės kultūra, vol. 35–36 of *Senoji Lietuvos literatūra*. Edited by Mintautas Čiurinskas. Vilnius: Lietuvių Literatūros ir Tautosakos Institutas, 2013.

Petrauskas, Rimvydas. *Lietuvos diduomenė XIV a. Pabaigoje—XV a. Sudėtis—struktūra—valdžia*. Vilnius: Aidai, 2003.

———. "Socialiniai ir istoriografiniai lietuvių kilmės iš romėnų teorijos aspektai." In *Literatūros istorija ir jos kūrėjai*, vol. 17 of *Senoji Lietuvos literatūra*, edited by Pietro Umberto Dini and Sigitas Narbutas, 270–285. Vilnius: Lietuvių literatūros ir tautosakos institutas, 2004.

———. "Lietuvos Didžiosios Kunigaikštystės seimo ištakos: didžiojo kunigaikščio taryba ir bajorų suvažiavimai XIV–XV a." *Parlamento studijos* 3 (2005): 10–32.

———. "LDK bajoriško seimo susiformavimas Vidurio Rytų Europos luominių susirinkimų kontekste." In *Parlamentarizmo genezė Europoje ir Lietuvos atvejis: tarptautinės konferencijos medžiaga*, edited by A. Lukošaitis, M. Urbonaitė, R. Budnikaitė, 5–15. Vilnius: Parlamentinio bendradarbiavimo centras, 2008.

_____. "Valdovas ir jo karūna: neįvykusios Vytauto karūnacijos aplinkybės." *Lietuvos istorijos metraštis* 2 (2009): 57–72.

_____. "Vėlyvųjų viduramžių Europa ir Lietuvos Didžiosios Kunigaikštystės visuomenės ir kultūros raida XIV–XVI amžiuje." *Lietuvos istorijos studijos* 23 (2009): 69–84.

_____. "Związki personalne między możnowładztwem Polski i Litwy od końca XIV do połowy XVI wieku." In *Narodziny Rzeczypospolitej. Studia z dziejów średniowiecza i czasów wczesnonowożytnych*, vol. 1, edited by Waldemar Bukowski and Tomasz Jurek, 479–496. Kraków: Societas Vistulana, 2012.

_____. "*Atrandant protėvius* genealoginio mąstymo prielaidos ir užuomazgos Lietuvoje XIV–XVI a. viduryje." In *Ministri historiae. Pagalbiniai istorijos mokslai Lietuvos Didžiosios Kunigaikštystės tyrimuose. Mokslinių straipsnių rinkinys, skirtas Edmundo Antano Rimšos 65-mečio sukakčiai*, edited by Zigmantas Kiaupa and Jolita Sarcevičienė, 45–63. Vilnius: Lietuvos istorijos instituto leidykla, 2013.

Piech, Zenon. *Monety, pieczęcie i herby w systemie symboli władzy Jagiellonów*. Warsaw: DiG, 2003.

Pietkiewicz, Krzysztof. *Itinerarium króla Aleksandra Jagiellończyka, 1492–1506.* Warsaw: Instytut Historii PAN, 2016.

Pieńkowska, Anna. *Zjazdy i sejmy z okresu bezkrólewia po śmierci Stefana Batorego*. Pultusk: Wydawnictwo Akademii Humanistycznej im. Aleksandra Gieysztora, 2010.

Pietrzyk-Reeves, Dorota. "O pojęciu *Rzeczpospolita (res publica)* w polskiej myśli politycznej XVI wieku." *Czasopismo Prawno-Historyczne* 62, no. 1 (2010): 37–64.

_____. *Ład rzeczypospolitej. Polska myśl polityczna XVI wieku a klasyczna tradycja republikańska*. Kraków: Wydawnictwo Księgarnia Akademicka, 2012.

Pfeiffer, Bogusław. *Caelum et Regnum. Studia nad symboliką państwa i władcy w polskiej literaturze i sztuce XVI i XVII stulecia*. Zielona Góra: Uniwersytet Zielonogórski, 2002.

Płachcińska, Krystyna. *Obraz kultury retorycznej społeczeństwa szlacheckiego na podstawie mów sejmowych z lat 1556–1564*. Łódź: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Łódzkiego, 2004.

Plečkaitis, Romanas. *Lietuvos filosofijos istorija*, vol. 1: *Viduramžiai—Renesansas—Naujieji amžiai*. Vilnius: Kultūros, filosofijos ir meno institutas, 2004.

Plokhy, Sergii. *The Origins of the Slavic nations. Premodern Identities in Russia, Ukraine, and Belarus*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006.

Pliuchanova, M. *Siuzhety i simvoly Moskovskogo tsarstva*. Saint Petersburg: Akropol', 1995.

Płaza, S. *Historia prawa w Polsce na tle porównawczym*, vol. 1: *X–XVIII w.* Kraków: Księgarnia Akademicka, 2002.

Pociūtė, Dainora. *Maištininkų katedros. Ankstyvoji reformacija ir lietuvių-italų evangelikų ryšiai*. Vilnius: Versus aureus, 2008.

Pocock, J. G. A. "The concept of a language and the métier d'historien: some considerations on practice." In *The Languages of Political Theory in Early Modern Europe*, edited by Anthony Pagden, 19–38. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987.

Political Culture in Central Europe (10th–20th Century), part 1: *Middle Ages and Early Modern Era*. Edited by Halina Manikowska and Jaroslav Pánek in cooperation with Martin Holý. Prague: Historický ústav Akademie věd, 2005.

Rabikauskas, Paulius. *Vilniaus akademija ir Lietuvos jėzuitai*, comp. Liudas Jovaiša. Vilnius: Aidai, 2002.

Rachuba, Andrzej. "Armia Wielkiego Księstwa Litewskiego jako czynnik unifikacji narodowej i kulturowej." *Przegląd Historyczny* 88, no. 2 (1997): 237–246.

_____. *Wielkie Księstwo Litewskie w systemie parlamentarnym Rzeczypospolitej w latach 1569–1763*. Warsaw: Wydawnictwo Sejmowe, 2002.

_____. "Sejmiki generalne Wielkiego Księstwa Litewskiego w Wolkowysku i Słonimiu." In *Między Zachodem a Wschodem. Studia z dziejów Rzeczypospolitej w epoce nowożytnej*, edited by Jacek Staszewski, Krzysztof Mikulski, and Jarosław Dumanowski, 42–53. Toruń: Wydawnictwo Adam Marszałek, 2002.

_____. "Fakcja Lwa Sapiehy—zarys problematyki." In *Między Lwowem a Wrocławiem. Księga jubileuszowa profesora Krystyna Matwijowskiego*, edited by Bogdan Rok and Jerzy Maron, 503–511. Toruń: Wydawnictwo Adam Marszałek, 2006.

_____. "Miejsca obrad sejmików Wielkiego Księstwa Liteskiego w latach 1569–1794". In *Parlamentskiia struktury ulady u sisteme dziazhaunaga kiravaniia Vialikaga kniastva Litouskaga i Rėchy Paspalitai u XV–XVIII stagoddziakh*, 183–197. Minsk, 2008.

_____. "W obronie tożsamości. Litwini wobec integracji we wspólnej Rzeczypospolitej." In *Unia lubelska z 1569 roku. Z tradycji unifikacyjnych I Rzeczypospolitej*, edited by Tomasz Kempa and Krzysztof Mikulski, 63–77. Toruń: Wydawnictwo Polskiego Towarzystwa Historycznego, 2011.

_____. "Lietuviai ir integracija į bendrą Respubliką: tapatybės gynimas" / "Litwini wobec integracji we wspólnej Rzaeczpospolitej—obrona tożsamości." In *Liublino unija: idėja ir jos tęstinumas / Unia lubelska: idea i jej kontynuacja*, edited by Liudas Glemža and Ramunė Šmigelskytė-Stukienė, 302–307 and 308–313. Vilnius: Nacionalinis muziejus Lietuvos Didžiosios Kunigaikštystės valdovų rūmai, 2011.

_____. "Uczestnicy sejmików litewskich w latach 1565–1764." In *Po unii—sejmiki szlacheckie w Rzeczypospolitej XVI–XVIII wieku*, edited by Henryk Lulewicz and Marek Wagner, 15–30. Siedlce: Instytus Historii i Stosunków Międzynarodowych Uniwersytetu Przyrodniczo-Humanistycznego w Siedlcach, 2013.

Radaman, A. "Kiravannie soimikavymi pasadzenniami u Vialikim Kniastve Litouskim, Ruskim i Zhamoitskim u drugoi palovine XVI–pachatku XVII st." *Vestsi Belarusskaga derzhaunaga pedagogichnaga universiteta* 2 (2002): 120–132.

Railaitė-Bardė, Agnė. "Didžiosios Kunigaikštystės kilmingųjų genealoginės savimonės XVI–XVIII a. legendinis ir sakralinis aspektai." In *Ministri historiae. Pagalbiniai istorijos mokslai Lietuvos Didžiosios Kunigaikštystės tyrimuose. Mokslinių straipsnių rinkinys, skirtas Edmundo Antano Rimšos 65-mečio sukakčiai*, edited by Zigmantas Kiaupa and Jolita Sarcevičienė, 379–403. Vilnius: Lietuvos istorijos instituto leidykla, 2013.

Ragauskienė, Raimonda. "Kalbinė padėtis Lietuvos Didžiojoje Kunigaikštystėje (iki XVI a. vid.): interpretacijos istoriografijoje." *Lituanistika* 59, no. 3 (2013): 138–157.

_____. "Maciej Sawicki (około 1530–1581) klient Radziwiłłów z Podlasia." In *Szlachta i ziemiaństwo na pograniczu kultur dawnej Rzeczypospolitej od XVI do początku XX wieku*, edited by Dorota Michaluk and Krzysztof Mikulski, 23–40. Warsaw: Wydawnictwo DiG, 2016.

Republicanism. A Shared European Heritage, vol. 1: *Republicanism and Constitutionalism in Early Modern Europe*. Edited by Martin van Gelderen and Quentin Skinner. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002.

Rietbergen, Peter. *Europe. A Cultural History*, part 3: *Continuity and Change. New Ways of looking at Man and the World*. New York: Routledge, 1998.

Rimsko–Konstantinopol´skoe nasledie na Rusi: ideia vlasti i politicheskaia praktika / L'eredità Romano-Constantinopolitana nelala Russia medioevale: idea del Potere e Pratica Politica. Moscow, 1995.

Rimša, Edmundas. "Stepono Batoro Lietuvos didieji antspaudai ir jų atsiradimo aplinkybės." *Lietuvos istorijos metraštis* 2 (2002) 213–228.

———. *Heraldika. Iš praeities į dabartį*. Vilnius: Versus Aureus, 2004.

———. *Heraldry past to present*. Translated from Lithuanian by Vijolė Arbas. Vilnius: Versus aureus, 2005.

———. "Nowe dane o litewskich pieczęciach państwowych Zygmunta III Wazy." *Litwa w epoce Wazów*, edited by Wojciech Kriegseisen and Andrzej Rachuba, 157–174. Warsaw: Neriton, 2006.

———. "Aleksandro antspaudai—naujas etapas valstybės sfragistikoje." In *Lietuvos didysis kunigaikštis Aleksandras ir jo epocha*, edited by Daiva Steponavičienė, 152–165. Vilnius: Vilniaus pilių valstybinio kultūrinio rezervato direkcija, 2007.

———. "Vytauto didysis antspaudas—pirmoji valdžios ir valstybės herbinė manifestacija." In *Jogailos ir Vytauto laikai*, 82–96. Kaunas: Vytauto Didžiojo universitetas, 2011.

———. "Horodlės aktai ir Lietuvos kilmingųjų heraldika / Akta horodelskie a heraldyka litewskich bojarów." In *1413 metų Horodlės aktai (Dokumentai ir tyrinėjimai) / Akty horodelskie z 1413 roku (Dokumenty i studia)*, edited by Jūratė Kiaupienė, Lidia Korczak, Piotr Rabiej, Edmundas Rimša, and Jan Wroniszewski, 173–254. Vilnius: Lietuvos istorijos instituto leidykla, 2013.

Rohdewald, Stefan, David A. Frick, and Stefan Wiederkehr, eds. *Litauen und Ruthenien: Studien zur einer transkulturellen Kommunikationsregion (15.-18. Jahrhundert)*. Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz Verlag, 2007.

Rosner, Anna. "Badania nad kulturą prawną. Próba zarysowania problematyki." In *Z dziejów kultury prawnej. Studia ofiarowane Profesorowi Juliuszowi Bardachowi w dziewięćdziesięciolecie urodzin*, edited by Honorata Dziewanowska, 585–597. Warsaw: Liber, 2004.

Roşu, Felicia. *Elective Monarchy in Transylvania and Poland-Lithuania, 1569–1587*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2017.

Rowell, S. C. *Lithuania Ascending. A Pagan Empire within East–Central Europe, 1295–1345*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994.

———. "Casimir Jagiellończyk and the Polish Gamble, 1445–7." *Lithuanian Historical Studies* 4 (1999): 7-39.

———. "Bears and Traitors, or Political Tensions in the Grand Duchy, ca. 1440–1481." *Lithuanian Historical Studies* 2 (1997): 28–55.

_____. "Išdavystė ar paprasti nesutarimai? Kazimieras Jogailaitis ir Lietuvos diduomenė 1440–1481 metais." In *Lietuvos valstybė XII–XVIII a.*, edited by Zigmantas Kiaupa, Arturas Mickevičius and Jolita Sarcevičienė, 45–74. Vilnius: Lietuvos istorijos instituto leidykla, 1997.

_____. "Amžinos pretenzijos arba kaip turime skaityti elitinę literatūrą?" In *Seminarai*, edited by Alvydas Jokubaitis and Antanas Kulakauskas, 7–30. Vilnius: Vyturys, 1998.

_____. *Iš viduramžių ūkų kylanti Lietuva. Pagonių imperija Rytų ir Vidurio Europoje, 1295–1345.* Translated from English by Osvaldas Aleksa. Vilnius: Baltos lankos, 2001.

Rubinstein, Nikolai. "The History of the Word *politicus* in Early Modern Europe." In The *Languages of Political Theory in Early Modern Europe*, edited by Anthony Pagden, 41–56. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987.

Rusina, Olena. "Kyiv iak sankta civitas u Moskovs´kii ideologii ta politichni praktitsi XIV–XVI st." In Olena Rusina, *Studii z istorii Kieva ta Kiivs′koi zemli.* Kyiv: Instytut istorii Ukrainy NAN Ukrainy, 2005.

Russocki, Stanisław. "Kultura polityczna i prawna (Refleksje historyka ustroju)." *Historyka. Studia metodologiczne* 11 (1982): 17–33.

_____. "Wokół pojęcia kultury prawnej." *Przegląd Humanistyczny* 11–12 (1986):15–22.

Rutkowska, Grażyna. *Itinerarium króla Kazimierza Jagiellończyka, 1440–1492.* Warsaw: Neriton, 2014.

Savisčevas, Eugenijus. "XV a. pirmosios pusės žemaičių aristokratijos socialinė transformacija." In *Konstantinas Jablonskis ir istorija*, edited by Edmundas Rimša, 171–196. Vilnius: Lietuvos istorijos leidykla, 2005.

_____. *Žemaitijos savivalda ir valdžios elitas 1409–1566m.* Vilnius: Vilniaus universiteto leidykla, 2010.

Scharnhorst, Jürgen, ed. *Sprachkultur und Sprachgeschichte. Herausbildung und Förderung von Sprachbewußtsein und wissenschaftlicher Sprachpflege in Europa.* Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang Europäischer Verlag der Wissenschaften, 1999.

Schölderle, Thomas. *Das Prinzip der Macht. Neuzeitliches Politik- und Staatsdenken bei Thomas Hobbes und Niccolo Machiavelli. Staatlichkeit im* Wandel, vol. 3. Berlin: Galda + Vilch Verlag, 2002.

Senosios Lietuvos literatūra 1253–1795, comp. Sigitas Narbutas. Vilnius: Lietuvių literatūros ir tautosakos institutas, 2011.

Seredyka, Jan. "Udział Radziwiłłów na seimach panowania Zygmunta III Wazy." *Miscellanea historico-archivistica* 3: *Radziwiłłowie XVI–XVIII wieku: W kręgu polityki i kultury* (1989): 13–26.

_____. "Instrukcje powiatu wileńskiego na sejmy panowania Zygmunta III Wazy." *Śląski kwartalnik historyczny Sobótka* 48, no. 2–3: *Studia Historyczno-Prawne. Prace ofiarowane Kazimierzowi Orzechowskiemu w 70 rocznicę urodzin* (1993): 189–197.

Siedina, Giovanna, ed. *Latinitas in the Polish Crown and the Grand Duchy of Lithuania. Its Impact on the Development of Identities.* Firenze: Firenze University Press, 2014.

Sinitsyna, Nina. *Tretii Rim. Istoki i evoliutsiia russkoi srednevekovoi kontseptsii (XV-XVI vv.).* Moscow: Indrik, 1998.

Sirutavičius, Marius. "Lietuvos valdovo reprezentacija diplomatinių santykių su Maskvos valstybe praktikoje XV–XVI a. sandūroje." In *Lietuvos didysis kunigaikštis Aleksandras ir jo*

epoch. Straipsnių rinkinys, edited by D. Steponavičienė, 113–122. Vilnius: Vilniaus pilių valstybinio kultūrinio rezervato direkcija, 2007.

————. "Maskvos pasiuntinių priėmimo ceremonialas Lietuvos valdovo dvare Vilniuje XV a. pabaigoje–XVI a. viduryje." In *Vilniaus Žemutinė pilis XIV–XIX a. pradžioje: 2005–2006 m. tyrimai*, edited by Liudas Glemža, 8–32. Vilnius: Pilių tyrimo centras "Lietuvos pilys," 2007.

————. "LDK Ponų taryba ir Maskvos bajorai: formalieji paralelinės diplomatijos aspektai 1492–1569 m." *Lietuvos istorijos metraštis* 2 (2010): 5–28.

————. "Lietuvos Didžiosios Kunigaikštystės ir Maskvos valstybės tarpvalstybinių sutarčių sudarymo ir ratifikavimo procedūros XV a. pabaigoje–XVI a. viduryje." In *Lietuvos Didžiosios Kunigaikštystės istorijos kraštovaizdis. Mokslinių straipsnių rinkinys*, edited by Ramunė Šmigelskytė-Stukienė, 195–220. Vilnius: Lietuvos istorijos instituto leidykla, 2012.

————. "Ponai tarėjai ir Maskvos valstybė: formalieji diplomatinių kontaktų aspektai pirmaisiais tarpuvaldžiais (1572–1576 m.)." *Lietuvos istorijos metraštis* 2 (2013): 65–85.

————. "Ceremonialinė mediacija Lietuvos Didžiosios Kunigaikštystės ir Maskvos valstybės diplomatiniuose santykiuose (XV a. pabaiga–1569 m.)." *Darbai ir dienos* 61 (2014): 167–182.

————. "Tarpvalstybinės sutartys Lietuvos ir Maskvs diplomatinių santykių praktikoje XV a. Pabaigoje—XVI a. Šeštajame dešimtmetyje." In *Lietuvos Didžiosios Kunigaikštystės ir Maskvos valstybės sutartys. 1449–1556 metai*, edited by Marius Sirutavičius, 19–43. Vilnius: Versus aureus, 2016.

Sirutavičius, Marius, ed. *Lietuvos Didžiosios Kunigaikštystės ir Maskvos valstybės sutartys. 1449–1556 metai.* Vilnius: Versus aureus, 2016.

Skowron, Ryszard, ed. *Polska wobec wielkich konfliktów w Europie nowożytnej. Z dziejów dyplomacji i stosunków międzynarodowych w XV–XVIII wieku.* Kraków: Societas Vistulana, 2009.

Sokołowski, Wojciech. "Radziwiłłowie wobec rokoszu Sandomirskiego (1606–1608)." *Miscellanea historico-archivistica* 3: *Radziwiłłowie XVI–XVIII wieku: W kręgu polityki i kultury* (1989): 67–83.

————. *Politycy schyłku złotego wieku. Małopolscy przywódcy szlachty i parlamentarzyści w latach 1574–1605.* Warsaw: Wydawnictwo Sejmowe, 1997.

Sójka-Zielińska, Katarzyna. "Stanisława Russockigo dyskurs historyczny o kulturze prawnej." In *Stanisław Russocki—badacz dziejów ustroju i prawa. W 45–lecie pracy naukowej*, edited by Honorata Dziewanowska, 31–39. Warsaw: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Warszawskiego, 1999.

Sobolewski, Marek. "Polska kultura polityczna i prawna w dawnych wiekach. Próba charakterystyki." *Czasopismo Prawno-Historyczne* 35, no. 2 (1983): 69–95.

Sowa, Jan. *Fantomowe ciało króla. Peryferyjne zmagania z nowoczesną formą.* Kraków: WPN Universitas Kraków, 2011.

Starchenko, Natalja. *Honour, Blood, and Rethoric. Conflicts in the Volhynian Gentry Milieu. Second Half of the 16th through the Early 17th Century.* Kyiv: Laurus, 2016.

Steponavičienė, Daiva, ed. *Lietuvos didysis kunigaikštis Aleksandras ir jo epocha.* Vilnius: Vilniaus pilių valstybinio kultūrinio rezervato direkcija, 2007.

Stollberg-Rilinger, Barbara, ed. *Was heißt Kulturgeschichte des Politischen?* Berlin: Duncker & Humboldt, 2005. Accessed November 19, 2014. http://www.d.umn.edu/schilton/Articles/GPD6.html.

Stone, Daniel. *The Polish-Lithuanian State, 1386–1795.* Seattle, WA: University of Washington Press, 1984.

Strojnowski, Andrzej, ed. *Kultura parlamentarna epoki staropolskiej.* Warsaw: DiG, 2013.

Sucheni-Grabowska, Anna. "Społeczność szlachecka a państwo." In *Polska w epoce Odrodzenia. Państwo-sołeczeństwo-kultura,* edited by Andrzej Wyczański, 13–107. Warsaw: Wiedza Powszechna, 1986.

———. *Wolność i prawo w staropolskiej koncepcji państwa.* Warsaw: Muzeum Historii Polski, 2009.

Suchocki, Jerzy. "Formowanie się i skład narodu politycznego w Wielkim Księstwie Litewskim późnego średniowiecza." *Zapiski Historyczne* 48 (1983): 31–78.

Schramm, Gottfried. "Polen—Böhmen—Ungarn. Übernationale Gemeinsamkeiten in der politischen Kultur des späten Mittelalters und der frühen Neuzeit." *Przegląd Historyczny* 76, no. 3 (1985): 417–437.

Schramm, Percy Ernst. *Herrschaftszeichen und Staatssymbolik,* parts 1–3. Stuttgart: Hiersemann, 1954–1956.

———. *Kaiser, Könige und Päpste,* parts 1–4. Stuttgart: Hiersemann, 1968–1971.

Šapoka, Adolfas. *Lietuva ir Lenkija po 1569 metų Liublino unijos. Jų valstybinių santykių bruožai.* Kaunas, 1938.

Šešioliktojo amžiaus raštija, vol. 5 of *Senoji Lietuvos literatūra.* Edited by Sigitas Narbutas. Vilnius: Pradai, 2000.

Šiaučiūnaitė-Verbickienė, Jurgita. "The Social and Legal Status of Jews in the Grand Duchy of Lithuania and Its Influences on the Status of Tatars and Karaites." *Central Europe* 8, no. 2 (November 2010): 65–86.

Šiaučiūnaitė-Verbickienė, Jurgita, and Larisa Lempertienė, eds. *Jewish Space in Central and Eastern Europe: Day-to-Day History.* Newcastle: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2007.

Temčinas, Sergejus. "Lietuvos Didžiosios Kunigaikštystės rusėniškoji literatūra kaip kultūrinės integracijos modelis." In *Lietuvos Didžiosios Kunigaikštijos tradicija ir tautiniai naratyvai,* edited by Alfredas Bumblauskas and Sigitas Jegelevičius, 53–85. Vilnius: Vilniaus universiteto leidykla, 2009.

Tęgowski, Jan. *Rodowód kniaziów Świrskich do końca XVI wieku.* Wrocław: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Wrocławskiego, 2011.

Tiumentsev, I. S. *Smuta v Rossi v nachale XVII stoletiia: Dvizhenie Lzhedimitriia II.* Volgograd: Izdatel'stvo VolGU, 1999.

Tyla, Antanas. "Lietuvos Didžiosios Kunigaikštystės geopolitinė padėtis ir piliečių politinė kultūra XVI a. Pabaigoje—XVII a." In *Ministri historiae. Pagalbiniai istorijos mokslai Lietuvos Didžiosios Kunigaikštystės tyrimuose. Mokslinių straipsnių rinkinys, skirtas Edmundo Antano Rimšos 65-mečio sukakčiai,* edited by Zigmantas Kiaupa and Jolita Sarcevičienė, 333–342. Vilnius: Lietuvos istorijos instituto leidykla, 2013.

Trawicka, Zofia. "Diariusze sejmowe z lat 1638–1639." In *Parlamentaryzm i prawodawstwo przez wieki. Prace dedykowane Prof. Stanisławowi Płazie w siedemdziesiątą rocznicę*, edited by Jerzy Malec and Wacław Uruszczak, 45–52. Kraków: UJ, 1999.

Trencsényi, Balázs, and Márton Zászkaliczky, eds. *Whose Love of which Country? Composite States, National Histories and Patriotic Discourses in Early Modern East Central Europe*. Leiden: Brill, 2010.

Trimonienė, Rita. "Lietuvos Didžiosios Kunigaikštystės vidaus konsolidacijos ir *politinės tautos* formavimosi problema." *Lietuvos istorijos studijos* 2 (1994): 17–34.

_____. *Lietuvos Didžioji Kunigaikštystė ir Vidurio Europa XV-XVi a. sandūroje*. Šiauliai: Šiaulių pedagoginis institutas, 1996.

Trimonienė, Rita, and Gudavičius, Edvardas. "Bajoriškoji lietuvių tauta ir Lietuvos Didžioji Kunigaikštija." *Dienovidis*, February 5–11, 1999, no. 5 (407), 10; February 12–18, 1999, no. 6 (408), 13; February 19–25, 1999, no. 7 (409), 10; February 26–March 4, 1999, nr. 8 (410), 12; March 5–11, nr. 9 (411), 10.

Ulčinaitė, Eugenija. *Lietuvos Renesanso ir Baroko literatūra*. Vilnius: Vilniaus universiteto leidykla, 2001.

_____. "Petro Skargos 'Seimo pamokslai': retorikos ir didaktikos dermė." In *Petras Skarga. Seimo pamokslai*, edited by Viktorija Vaitkevičiūtė, 9–21. Vilnius: Lietuvių literatūros ir tautosakos institutas, 2014.

Uruszczak, Wacław. "Zasada *lex est rex* w Polsce XVI wieku. Studia Historyczno-Prawne." *Śląski kwartalnik historyczny Sobótka* XLVIII, no. 2–3: *Prace ofiarowane Kazimierzowi Orzechowskiemu w 70 rocznicę urodzin* (1993): 149–157.

_____. "Ustawy Zygmunta I z lat 1530–1538 w sprawie elekcji królewskiej." In *Prawo wczoraj i dziś. Studia dedykowane profesor Katarzynie Sójce-Zielińskiej*, edited by Grażyna Bałtruszajtys, 349–360. Warsaw: Liber, 2000.

_____. "*Sejm walny wszystkich państw naszych.*Sejm w Radomiu z 1505 roku i konstytucja *Nihil novi.*" *Czasopismo Prawno-Historyczne* 57, no. 1 (2005): 11–25.

_____. "*Commune incliti Poloniae Regni privilegium constitutionum et indultum*. O tytule i mocy prawnej Statutu Łaskiego z 1506 roku." In *Prace Instytutu prawa własności intelektualnej UJ 96: Prace poświęcone pamięci Adama Uruszczaka* (2006): 115–135.

_____. "Najstarszy sejm walny koronny 'dwuizbowy' w Piotrkowie w 1468 roku." In *Narodziny Rzeczypospolitej. Studia z dziejów średniowiecza i czasów wczesnonowożytnych*, edited by Waldemar Bukowski and Tomasz Jurek, vol 1: *1033–1056*. Kraków: Towarzystwo Naukowe "Societas Vistulana," 2012.

_____. *Unio regnorum sub una corona non causat eorum unitatem. Unia Polski i Litwy w Krewie w 1385 r. Studium historyczno-prawne*. Kraków: Uniwersytet Jagielloński w Krakowie, 2017.

Usachev, A. S. "*Tretii Rim* ili *Tretii Kiev*? (Moskovskoe tsarstvo XVI veka v vospriiatii sovremennikov)." In *Obshchestvennye nauki i sovremennost´* 1 (2012). Accessed August 29, 2016. ecsosman.hs.ru/data/2015/04/05/125118835/Usachyov.pdf.

Uspenskij, Boris A., and Zhivov, Victor. *"Tsar and God"and other Essays in Russian Cultural Semiotics*. Translated from Russian by Marcus C. Levitt, David Budgen, and Liv Bliss. Edited by Marcus C. Levit. Boston: Academic Studies Press, 2012.

Valikonytė, Irena. "Konstitucijos link. Lietuvos Statutas bajoriškos visuomenės vertybių hierarchijoje." In *Mūsų konstitucionalizmo raida*, edited by A. V. Bartkutė and A. Vaišnys, 6-19. Vilnius: Valstybės žinios, 2003.

Vilimas, Darius. *Lietuvos Didžiosios Kunigaikštystės žemės teismo sistemos formavimasis (1564–1588)*. Vilnius: Lietuvos istorijos instituto leidykla, 2006.

———. "Teisminės kultūros atspindžiai Kauno pavieto žemės teismuose XVI a. devintajame dešimtmetyje." In *Lietuvos Didžiosios Kunigaikštystės istorijos kraštovaizdis. Mokslinių straipsnių rinkinys. Skiriama profesorės Jūratės Kiaupienės 65-mečiui*, edited by Ramunė Šmigelskytė-Stukienė, 503–524. Vilnius: Lietuvos istorijos instituto leidykla, 2012.

Vocelka, Karl. *Die Politische Propaganda Kaiser Rudolfs II. (1576–1612)*. Wien: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1981.

———. *Habsburgische Hochzeiten 1550–1600. Kulturgeschichtliche studien zum manieristischen Repräsentationsfest*. Wien: Hermann Böhlaus Nachf., 1976.

Volungevičius, Vytautas. *Pilies šešėlyje. Teritorija, visuomenė ir valdžia Lietuvos Didžiojoje Kunigaikštystėje*. Vilnius: Lietuvių katalikų mokslų akademija, Naujasis Židinys–Aidai, 2015.

Wandycz, Piotr. *The Price of Freedom. A history of East Cenral Europe from Middle Ages to the Present*. London: Routlege, 1992.

Wasilewski, Tadeusz. "Nobilitacje miast w dawnej Rzeczypospolitej Obojga Narodów." In *Czas, przestrzeń, praca w dawnych miastach. Studia ofiarowane Henrykowi Samsonowiczowi w sześćdziesiątą rocznicę urodin*, edited by Andrzej Wyrobisz, Michał Tymowski, Wojciech Fałkowski, and Zbigniew Morawski, 373–385. Warsaw: Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN, 1991.

Wielka Historia Polski, vol. 3, part 1: *Rzeczpospolita w dobie złotej wolności (1648–1763)*. Edited by Józef Andrzej Gierowski. Kraków: Świat książki, 2003.

Wisner, Henryk. "Litwa wobec rokoszu (1606–1607)." *Kwartalnik Historyczny* LXXIX, no. 2 (1972): 278–299.

———. "Naprawa państwa w uchwałach sejmików Wielkiego Księstwa Litewskiego w pierwszej połowie XVII w." In *Studia polsko-litewsko-białoruskie*, edited by Jerzy Tomaszewski, Elżbieta Smułkowa, and Henryk Majecki, 33–50. Warsaw: Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe, 1988.

———. "Sejmiki litewskie w czasach Zygmunta III i Władysława IV. Konwokacja wileńska oraz sejmiki przedsejmowe i relacyjne." In *Miscellanea historico-archivistica* 3: *Radziwiłłowie XVI–XVIII wieku: W kręgu polityki i kultury* (1989): 51–66.

———. "Hierarchia urzędów świeckich Wielkiego Księstwa Litewskiego w świetle projektu poprawy systemu obronnego (1601 r.)." In *Miscellanea historico-archivistica* 7 (1997): 45–49.

———. *Rzeczpospolita Wazów*, vol. 1: *Czasy Zygmunta III i Władysława IV*. Warsaw: Neriton, 2002.

———. *Rzeczpospolita Wazów*, vol. 3: *Slawne Państwo, Wielkie Księstwo Litewskie*. Warsaw: Neriton, 2008.

Wojtkowiak, Zbysław. *Lithuania Transwilniensis saec. XIV–XVI. Podziały Litwy północnej w późnym średniowieczu*. Poznań: Wydawnictwo Poznańskie, 2005.

Wolff, Józef L. *Kniaziowie Litewsko–Ruscy od końca czternastego wieku*. Warsaw: Gebethner i Wolff, 1895.

Wroniszewski, Łukasz. "Pieczęcie polskie przy dokumentach horodelskich w świetle polskiej średniowiecznej sfragistyki / Lenkiški antspaudai prie Horodlės dokumentų Lenkijos Viduramžių sfragistikos šviesoje." In *1413 metų Horodlės aktai (Dokumentai ir tyrinėjimai) / Akty horodelskie z 1413 roku (Dokumenty i studia)*, edited by Jūratė Kiaupienė, Lidia Korczak, Piotr Rabiej, Edmundas Rimša, and Jan Wroniszewski, 145–159 and 160–172. Vilnius: Lietuvos istorijos instituto leidykla, 2013.

———. "Wzrost znaczenia sejmików w czasach Stefana Batorego na przykładzie sejmu 1578 roku." In *Kultura parlamentarna epoki staropolskiej*, edited by Andrzej Stroynowski, 129–141. Warsaw: DiG, 2013.

Wünsch, Thomas. "Mittelarterliche Anfänge der Parlamentageschichte: Heiliges Römisches Reich und Polnisch-Litauische Union im Vergleich." *Studia Warmińskie* 27 (2000): 69–88.

Zakrzewski, Andrzej B. "Oferta Jana Januszowskiego wobec Lwa Sapihy, czyli nieznany projekt wydania praw i przywilejów litewskich z 1611 roku." In *Prawo wczoraj i dziś. Studia dedykowane profesor Katarzynie Sójce-Zielińskiej*, edited by Grażyna Bałtruszajtys, 435–441. Warsaw: Liber, 2000.

———. *Sejmiki Wielkiego Księstwa Litewskiego XVI–XVIII w. Ustrój i funkcjonowanie: sejmik trocki*. Warsaw: Liber, 2000.

———. "O kulturze prawnej Wielkiego Księstwa Litewskiego XVI–XVIII wieku." In *Kultura i języki Wielkiego Księstwa Litewskiego*, edited by Maria Teresa Lizisowa. Kraków: Collegium Columbinum, 2005.

———. "Statuty w kulturze prawnej Wielkiego Księstwa Litewskiego." In *Pirmasis Lietuvos Statutas ir epocha*, edited by Irena Valikonytė and Lirija Steponavičienė, 177–194. Vilnius: Vilniaus universiteto leidykla, 2005.

———. "Zakaz, którego nie było. O rzekomym zakazie drukowania III Statutu w języku oryginalu i kilku innych wątpliwościach." In *Studia z dziejów państwa i prawa polskiego* 9, no. 1 (2006): 227–237.

———. "Odrębność systemu parlamentarnego Wielkiego Księstwa Litewskiego w XVI–XVIII wieku." In *Rzeczpospolita w XVI–XVIII wieku. Państwo czy wspólnota?*, edited by Bogusłw Dybaś, Pawel Hanczewski and Tomasz Kempa, 107–128. Toruń: Wydawnictwo Naukowe Uniwersytetu Mikołaja Kopernika, 2007.

———. *Wielkie Księstwo Litewskie (XVI–XVIII w.). Prawo—ustrój—społeczeństwo*. Warsaw: Campidoglio, 2013.

———. "III Statut Litewski a Lew Sapieha." In *Studia z dziejów Wielkiego Księstwa Litewskiego (XVI–XVIII wieku)*, edited by Sławomir Górzyński and Mirosław Nagielski, 457–464. Warsaw: DiG, 2014.

———. "Naiwność czy taktyka? Uzasadnianie prób unifikacji prawa litewskiego i koronnego XVI–XVIII wieku." In *Lietuvos Statutas ir Lietuvos Didžiosios Kunigaikštystės bajoriškoji visuomenė*, edited by Irena Valikonytė and Lirija Steponavičienė, 75–83. Vilnius: Vilniaus universiteto leidykla, 2015.

Zujienė, Gitana. *Insignijos ir ceremonialas Lietuvos viešajame gyvenime (XIII–XVIII a.)*. Vilnius: Eugrimas, 2008.

Index